00111824

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 March, 2016

GENERAL HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH:

FROM THE GERMAN OF

DR AUGUSTUS NEANDER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE LAST EDITION.

11182 4

BY JOSEPH TORREY,

PROFESSOR OF MORAL AND INTELLECTUAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

a C

"I am come to send fire on the earth."—*Words of our Lord.*
"And the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is." "But other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus."—*St Paul.*

VOLUME IX.

PUBLISHED FROM THE POSTHUMOUS PAPERS,

BY K. F. TH. SCHNEIDER.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.; WARD AND CO.; JACKSON AND WALFORD, ETC. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON, AND HODGES AND SMITH.

MDCCCLV.

PRINTED BY
ROBERT PARK
DUNDEE.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

On me, after the death of my much loved teacher and paternal friend, was devolved the task of preparing for the press the last greater work of the lamented Neander, the sixth volume of his church history. Having discharged this no less honourable than arduous duty, I now think it due to the respected reader that I should give some brief account of the method according to which I have proceeded.

In the abstract, two possible ways indeed presented themselves in which this volume might be prepared for the public eye: either to follow out the subject, in accordance with the plan and preparatory labours of Neander down to the point of time he originally proposed to himself—the commencement of the Reformation—or to publish it in the fragmentary shape in which it was left. Pious regard to the style of a work peculiarly original in its kind, and the design of Neander, expressed shortly before his death, of publishing a part of the materials here presented as the first division of the sixth volume, equally forbade the former of these methods. And yet in adopting the latter plan, liberty was still left to the editor of executing his task in very different ways. He might, perhaps, consider himself justified, in the case of fragments of this sort, in giving them a finer polish by applying the last finishing hand. But the undersigned has felt bound to abstain even from this. It has been his endeavour to present the work of Neander with the least possible curtailment, and with the least possible additions of his own; and it has been his wish rather to be found too faithfully exact, or if you please slavish, than arbitrary in the labours he has be-

stowed. Nevertheless, in hundreds of places he has altered the text, and in a still greater number of instances corrected the notes. But in so doing he has only taken the same liberty which the lamented author, while living, had already allowed him to use in the publication of his more recent works, the new editions of St Bernard, of Chrysostom, and of Tertullian; with this difference, indeed, that with regard to these latter, he could in all difficult cases refer to the author himself, while in the present case, he had to decide according to his own best judgment. Unhappily the editor, who by long exercise had become tolerably familiar with Neander's method of composing, did not have it in his power to lend the beloved man of God a helping hand, except in a small portion of this work; and various circumstances, such as a growing infirmity of sight, and occasional sudden interruptions closely connected with this calamity, the illegibility of his excerpts made in earlier years, want of practice in his last assistants, and various other causes, conspired together to render his labours more difficult, nay, if possible, distasteful to the restlessly active investigator. Once and again he had even entertained the thought of bringing his work to a close in the form of a brief compendium; but strong attachment to the labour of his life, ever breaking forth afresh, and the hope that he might perhaps yet recover the use of his eye-sight, constantly brought him back again to the extremely painful and yet dearly beloved continuation of the task he had begun. How natural, that the manuscripts he left behind him should also, in various ways, bear upon them the marks of their origin. The editor, therefore, has not hesitated to correct all manifest errors of fact, so far as they came to his knowledge, whether arising from some misunderstanding of the assistants, or, as the case often was, from the illegibility of Neander's excerpts, or from any other cause. Or ought he to have hesitated to do this when, for example, the MSS. p. 506, spoke of a Marshal of the empire by the name of Von Pappenheim, or when, p. 463, the Easter festival was said to fall on the 31st of May, or when the text read "*That* one *Cardinal John* would bring disgrace upon the pope and cardinals;" or when, as was not seldom the case in the section concerning Matthias of Janow, the translation conveyed an almost directly contrary meaning to the correct reading of the original?

On the other hand, in all cases where the matter was at all doubtful to me, I have allowed the text to be printed without alteration, or at most (compare, *e.g.*, p. 431, and 468,) simply intimated my doubts in the shape of notes. The style moreover has been, in here and there an instance, slightly altered by me, and repetitions of longer or shorter extent, such as were almost unavoidable in a work which sprang purely out of the recollection of Neander, expunged. Among the papers, furthermore, were found a series of sheets which Neander had marked, partly with a conjectural indication of their being designed, on a final revision for insertion, in their appropriate places. These I have carefully inserted wherever it could be done, either at once, or only with some slight alteration of form, and have never laid them aside except in those cases where their insertion would have required an entire recasting of the text. But additions and the completion of defective parts, in the strict and proper sense, I have never allowed myself to make, except on literary points, and that in perfect accordance with Neander's wishes. Unhappily the more recent works on church history are often in this respect, in the highest degree unreliable, as one author is found to copy the false citations of another. Lewis's History of the Life and Sufferings of John Wicklif, for example, is a work which seems actually to have been in the hands of very few of our church historians.

In proceeding to make a few brief remarks on single portions of the present volume, let me begin by observing that the first portion which relates to the history of the papacy and of the church constitution down to the time of the council of Basle, as it was the earliest in the time of its composition, is manifestly also the most complete as to form. As regards the continuation of this section, Neander left behind only a series of preparatory papers, but no proper sketch of the whole, nor even elaboration of single passages. This latter labour had been bestowed indeed upon passages belonging to the second section treating of the Reformation of England; yet these single passages, attached for the most part to the unfinished exposition of Wicklif's doctrines, were so unconnected, that the editor felt himself compelled, in following out his principle, to leave them aside. And he considered himself the more justified in so doing, because they

contained little else than translations of single passages from the work of Vaughan. The third principal section, relating to the history of the Bohemian reformers, belongs among those parts which Neander constantly treated with especial predilection. It will assuredly afford no small satisfaction to the admirers of the great departed, to find that it was at least permitted him to bring to its close the history of John Huss; and if this, too, is here presented to us, as the well informed reader will be at no loss to discern that it is, only in its first rough sketch, yet this very circumstance enables us to see more profoundly into the intellectual power and vigour of the departed historian, which was preserved unimpaired to the end. We can only wish that the new light thrown by Neander on the great Bohemian reformers might serve as a stimulus to some competent hand soon to furnish us with an edition of the hitherto unpublished writings of Militz, of Conrad of Waldhausen, and particularly of the pioneer work of Matthias of Janow! Also a new edition of the works of John Huss, or at least the preparation of a chronologically arranged edition of his letters, belongs among the *piis desideriis* in the department of church history. Many of the preliminary labours to such a performance are to be found in the excellent work of Palacky. Neander has repeatedly alluded to the incorrectness and inexactitude of the Nurenberg edition of 1558, and the passages adduced by him might easily be multiplied to tenfold the number. Such a monument is due from us Protestants to the memory of John Huss, of whom our Luther, in his lectures on Isaiah, so strikingly remarks: "Existimo Johannem Huss suo sanguine perperisse Evangelion, quod nunc habemus." A man of learning so enthusiastic in his admiration of Huss as M. Ferdinand B. Mikowic, who has already favoured us with a new corrected translation of the letters that had been already published by Luther, would be just the person to engage in such an undertaking. The Bohemian work containing the letter of Huss should be published in Bohemian, with a German or Latin translation on the opposite columns. Such an enterprise would certainly be crowned with success. Finally, on the section relating to the German Friends of God, Neander was still occupied during the last days of his life; in truth, the habitual occupation of his mind with the work of his life intermingled among

the pleasing fancies that floated before the mind of this departing friend of God.

Gladly would I, in compliance with the urgent wishes of Neander's admirers, have hurried to a speedier conclusion the publication of the present volume; but this could not be done in connection with my professional duties. Besides, there were other hindrances. The library of Neander, unhappily, did not stand at my command. Several works and editions which Neander had cited, such as Lewis's History of Wicklif, and the first edition of Vaughan's work, were not to be found, even in the Royal Library in this place, and they could not otherwise be obtained than by ordering them from England. I may doubtless rely, therefore, on the kind indulgence of my readers. But I confidently hope, too, and this would be my best reward, that faithfulness to my never to be forgotten master, and to his work, will not be found wanting.

K. F. TH. SCHNEIDER.

BERLIN, October 31st, 1851.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOLUME NINTH.

SIXTH PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

FROM BONIFACE VIII. TO THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION.

SECTION FIRST.

HISTORY OF THE PAPACY AND OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION DOWN TO THE BEGINNING OF THE COUNCIL OF BASLE. P. 1—181.

Page.

Character of this period as a period of transition, particularly evinced in the *history of the papacy*, ... 1

Boniface VIII. Bestowment of indulgences on occasion of the Jubilee, A.D. 1300, ... 5

The bull Clericos laicos of the year 1296, ... 8

Controversial tract by *Ægidius of Rome*, ... 18

Treatise by *John of Paris* on royal and papal authority, . . . 21

Benedict XI. Makes advances to meet France. His speedy death, . 26

Quarrel between the Italian and the French party in the choice of a new pope. *Transfer of the papal residence to Avignon in* 1309, . 27

The consequences of this transfer, ... 29

Dependence of Clement V. upon Philip. Abolishment of the order of the Knights Templar, ... 31

John XXII. Ban and interdict against Louis the Bavarian, . . . 33

Marsilius of Padua. His Defensor Pacis, a foretoken of the Protestant spirit, ... 36

Louis in Rome. Accusation and deposition of John XXII. and election of Nicholas V., ... 48

William Occam: against the papal plenitudo potestatis in temporalibus, 51

Benedict XII. a man with the severity of a reformer, ... 54

Clement VI., ... 57

Page.
Emperor Charles IV., ... 58
Gregory XI., ... 60
Origin of the forty years' *schism in the church.* Election of Urban VI. Election of Clement VII. at Ferredi, ... 63
Clement at Avignon, ... 66
Henry of Langenstein's Consilium pacis of the year 1381, . . 66
Urban VI., ... 69
Boniface IX., ... 70
Formal opinion drawn up by the Paris University, A.D. 1394, composed by Nicholas of Clemangis: *Via cessionis, compromissi, concilii generalis,* 74
Answer of the king. Bold letter of the University to the pope, . 76
Displeasure of the pope with the University. Death of Clement VII. Hurried election of Benedict XIII., ... 76
Clemangis' work de ruina ecclesiae, ... 79
Clemangis' work de studio theologico, ... 81
Bold letter of the Paris University addressed to the newly elected pope Benedict XIII., and evasive reply of the latter, ... 85
The three principal church parties. The advocates of the medieval ecclesiastical law (Toulouse). The reckless advocates of the new ecclesiastical law. The moderate advocates of the new system (as Gerson, D'Ailly), ... 86
The particular position of *Nicholas of Clemangis,* 87
Partial return of the French church to obedience to Benedict in the year 1404, ... 94
Innocent VII. dies 1406. Election of the octogenary Gregory XII., . 95
Gerson's principles of reform. Restoration of the church *theocracy to its foundation as it was before the middle ages,* 115
The Council of Pisa, ... 119
Clemengis on the failure of the council of Pisa, ... 120
Cardinal *Balthazar Cossa,* 123
Gerson's sermo coram rege soon after Alexander's election, (his hopes of a union with the Greeks), ... 126
D'Ailly's tract de difficultate reformationis in concilio universali, . 127
Gerson's work concerning the right union and reformation of the church by a general council, ... 135
Quarrel between Ladislaus of Naples and John, ... 138

THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

Preparation for the transactions of the council by D'Ailly's monita de necessitate reformationis ecclesiae in capite et in membris, . 138
Presentation of charges against the pope in February 1415, . . 143
The pope's letters from Schaffhausen. Threatening schism in the council. Proposal to exclude the cardinals in the transactions relating to reform. Discourse of the Benedictine Gentianus against the pope and the cardinals, ... 150
Citation of the pope on the 2d of May. His deposition, . . 151

Page.
Negotiations with Gregory and Benedict, ... 151
Appointment of a collegium reformatorium already in August, 1415, 154
Nicholas of Clemangis on the council, ... 160
Resolution of the council respecting the frequent appointment of general councils, ... 170
Last session of the council on the 22d of April, 1418, ... 173
Council of Pavia in 1423, ... 174

SECTION SECOND.

RELATING TO THE HISTORY OF THEOLOGY AND DOCTRINE. P. 182.

I. *The Reformatory movements in England.* P. 182.

Way prepared for greater freedom in the expression of religious convictions by the usurpations of the hierarchy since the time of Innocent III. by Robert Grossheads, Roger Bacon, by the quarrel with the mendicant monks by Richard of Armagh. The English parliament under Edward III., ... 183
John Wicklif, ... 185
Wicklif's principles of reform, ... 187
Wicklif as an opponent of the mendicant monks, ... 191
Wicklif as teacher of Theology and Philosophy at Oxford, . . 194
Society of "poor priests," afterwards called Lollards, . . 197
Wicklif's enemies, particularly among the mendicant monks. . 198
The three condemnatory bulls of Gregory XI. of the year 1377, . 200
Wicklif protected by the civil power, ... 202
Wicklif's severe illness in the year 1379, ... 203
Wicklif's translation of the Bible in the year 1380 (John of Trevisa) . 205
His arguments against the doctrine of transubstantiation, . . 206
Wicklif's doctrine of the Lord's supper, ... 213
Wicklif's memorial to parliament, ... 222
Wicklif from the year 1382 in retirement at Lutterworth, . . 224
Wicklif's doctrines, ... 226
His doctrine of predestination, ... 228
His genuinely protestant principle of sole reference to Christ, . . 230
Wicklif opposed to the multiplication of sacraments, . . 233

2. *Movements of Reform in Bohemia.* P. 236.

A. *The Forerunners of John Huss.* P. 236.

Militz of Kremsia, ... 240

Page.

Conrad of Waldhausen, an Austrian. Augustinian and priest at Vienna from 1345, ... 259
Matthias of Janow. His relation to Huss. 264
Janow's Work, De regulis Veteris et Novi Testamenti, . . 319

B. *John Huss, the Bohemian Reformer*. P. 319.

John Huss. Born in Husinetz on the 6th of July, 1369, . . 327
Connection between Oxford and Prague, ... 333
Influence of *Jerome of Prague*, ... 334
Convocation of the University on the 28th of May, 1403. Dispute on the *forty-five Wicklifite propositions*, ... 337
Emigration of the Germans from Prague in September, 1408, . . 344
Complaints of the clergy of Prague, against Huss, before the archbishop in the year 1409, ... 352
Zbynek espouses the cause of Alexander V., ... 363
Huss prepared to suffer martyrdom, and his foreboding of it, . . 364
Misapprehended doctrine of Huss respecting property, . . . 367
His tract De corpore Christi, ... 367
Citation of Huss to Bologna by Cardinal Colonna, . . . 371
Appointment of a commission for settling terms of peace in July, 1411, 372
Zbynek's letter of exculpation addressed to the king, . . . 374
The new archbishop Albic. Bull of crusade and indulgence issued by John XXIII. against Ladislaus of Naples, ... 376
Separation of Huss from Paletz. *Disputation of Huss on the matter of indulgences*, 7th of June, 1411, and his Quaestio de indulgentiis thence originating, ... 390
Royal edict against all public resistance to the papal bulls, . . 392
Paletz at the head of the eight doctors, ... 398
Michael de Causis at Rome. Transfer of the cause of Huss to Cardinal Peter de St Angelo. *Bann and interdict imposed on Huss under the most fearful formulas. Huss leaves Prague*, ... 401
Resolution by the college of the elders of the country to hold a country-synod (at Böhmisch-Brod) before Christmas of 1412, . . 404
Huss at Kozi-pradek. Composes his work De ecclesia: contrast drawn betwixt the clerus Christi and the clerus Antichristi, . . 417
Letters written by Huss from his place of exile, particularly to Prachatic: his consolation in trouble, ... 430
Journey of Huss through Germany, ... 437
Arrives at Constance on the 3d of November, ... 437
Huss proceeds to prepare himself to appear before the council. De fidei suae elucidatione [the agreement of his views with the faith of the church], ... 444
Occasion of the *seizure and imprisonment* of Huss on the 28th of November, 1414, ... 447
Committee appointed to examine Huss, 1st December, 1414, . . 460
Flight of John XXIII., and view taken of it by Huss. Stronger complaints against Huss, ... 465

Page.

His first hearing on the 5th of June. Interposition of the emperor to prevent his condemnation instanter on the ground of extracts made from his writings. *Second hearing* on the 7th of June, in presence of the emperor, ... 476

Third hearing on the 8th of June. A series of articles of complaint laid before the council, taken mostly from his work De ecclesia, . . 486

Proposition of the emperor to the council after this hearing, . . 487

Expectation of Huss to suffer martyrdom, ... 490

Remarkable interviews of Huss with an unknown individual proposing terms of recantation, ... 494

Impression produced on Huss by the imprisonment and deposition of John XXIII.: *Huss a genuine Christian martyr*, ... 500

Degradation of Huss, and his execution on the 6th of July. His fiery death. The scattering of his ashes, ... 506

Jerome of Prague. His residence in Bohemia and Moravia, at Paris, and at Hiedelberg, ... 514

Sentence passed and executed on Jerome on the 30th of May. His constancy as a martyr. Description of his martyrdom by Poggio, . 518

3. *The Friends of God in Germany.* P. 518—563.

On the Friends of God in general. Religious commotions in Germany ever since the end of the 13th century, called forth especially by spiritual and bodily distress, ... 526

Various kinds of hostility to the Friends of God. Their spiritual leaders. Complete submission to them. Rulmann Merswin. His course of life. His book on the nine rocks. His unchurchly tenets, . 530

Nicholas of Basle. Tauler's Friend of God, ... 535

The pantheistic, quietistic notions and the mistaken strivings after freedom attacked by Ruysbroch and Tauler. *John Ruysbroch* of Brussels, 547

John Tauler. Born in Strasburg, 1290. In 1308, a Dominican. Studies at Paris. Labours on the Rhine. Dies in 1361, . . . 555

Henry Suso of Suabia. Dominican. Born in 1300, died 1365. His writings, ... 561

The professions of the self-castigators or Flagellants, . . . 562

General Index, ... 565

CHURCH HISTORY.

SIXTH PERIOD. FROM BONIFACE VIII. TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE REFORMATION IN 1517.

SECTION FIRST.

HISTORY OF THE PAPACY AND OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

THE period of Church History which we now propose to consider, is one where an old creation of Christianity, showing signs of decay and an ever increasing tendency to corruption, is passing over to the new one which was destined to succeed it. The peculiarity of such a period of transition, conducting from the dissolution of an old, to the dawning life of a new world, is, that on the one hand, we see all the corruptions that had so long been preparing, finally reach their highest point, and on the other, occasioned and urged forward by those very corruptions, the reaction of new tendencies of the Christian spirit, betokening new and better times. The stirrings of a new spirit, manifesting itself with fresh and ever increasing vigour in its struggles with the old, and the multiform combinations in which new and old appear commingled, form the significant feature of this period. Such periods of transition are of peculiar interest, because we see in them the first unfolding of those germs in which the future lies hidden. These remarks apply in a particular manner to that portion of the history of the papacy which we propose, first of all, to consider. The power of the papacy, having its seat in the affections of men, and resting on their most profound convictions, could not be overthrown by any force coming from

without. Every struggle, as we have seen, in which it was aimed to effect this overthrow, resulted eventually in a failure, so long as this power in the mind of the nations was a necessary one in the historical progress of the church. But this power must prepare the way for its own destruction by its increasing worldliness, and desecration to subserve selfish ends; and thus were called forth, in ever increasing force, the reactions of the Christian spirit struggling for freedom, and attempts at reform constantly growing more violent. Such a state of things we shall see developing itself more and more distinctly from the time of Boniface VIII. and onward. This pope, a man without any pretensions to spiritual character, or even moral worth, carried papal absolutism to the highest pitch it ever reached; and he was forced to see himself reduced to the most severe humiliations; nor can we fail to recognize the guiding hand of a higher wisdom, when we observe how the humiliations to which he was reduced contributed, by the consequences that followed, to bring on that whole train of succeeding contests which made the existing church-system of the medieval theocracy totter to its foundation. We shall here be able to trace the connection of one link with another in the chain of these great events, down to the time of the general councils.

Cardinal Benedict Cajetan, a man supremely governed by considerations of worldly interest, after having by crafty management procured the abdication of his predecessor, Celestin, whose temper presented the strongest contrast to his own, succeeded next, by the same arts, in reaching the consummation of all his wishes and designs, the papal chair; and his whole administration was of a piece with such a beginning. His suspicions compelled him to keep his predecessor closely confined; for he was afraid that Celestin might be persuaded to reassert his claims to the papal dignity; and was certain that if he did so, he would be backed up by a party of malcontents who had always denied the lawfulness of his abdication, since they maintained that he who held the highest station on earth, the pope, could never, either by his own act or that of others, be discharged from the responsibility which God had laid on him. Constant additions would naturally be made to this party, in consequence of the manner in which Boniface administered the papacy, and

they would welcome any opportunity of securing for themselves such a rallying point. The anxiety of Boniface was assuredly, therefore, not without foundation. Celestin, however, bore his confinement and the dishonourable treatment to which he was subjected, with calm resignation; and in this confinement he met his end in a manner worthy of his pious life. A report, which, if not true, shows at least in what light Boniface was regarded by his contemporaries, charges him with the crime of taking off Celestin by poison.

Boniface manifested from the beginning, that the motives by which he was supremely governed, were ambition, avarice, and revenge. Conscientious scruples never deterred him from resorting to any means whereby something more could be added to his treasures.[1] The pope's plenitude of power, the interest of the church, must serve to palliate the worst oppressions. He also sowed the seeds of a great deal of corruption, in the next succeeding times, by elevating, without the least regard to the good of the church, his own kinsmen to the rank of cardinals, or to the higher spiritual dignities. One bad means to which he resorted to replenish his treasury, was taking advantage of the great festival connected with the ushering in of the fourteenth century: whether the fact was, that the pope's cupidity merely availed itself of an occurrence which would have taken place without his seeking, or whether the whole thing was purely a contrivance of his own. As the beginning of the new century drew near, a report was circulated through Rome, that all persons visiting the church of St Peter in that city on the first day of January, should obtain an extraordinary indulgence. Moved by this report, multitudes flocked to the church towards evening, filling it to overflowing, so that it was nearly impossible to press

1 A contemporary, John Villani, the Florentine historian, says of him that he knew how to maintain and promote the interests of the church. (Seppo bene mantenere e avanzare le ragioni della chiesa.) But what interests? He explains by saying the pope accumulated a vast amount of money for the purpose of aggrandizing the church, and ennobling his family, having no scruples about the means (non facendo conscienza di guadagno), for he said, It was allowable to do anything to advance the interests of the church. The same writer remarks that he was a man of lofty spirit, (molto magnanimo,) and understood well how to play the lord (e signorile, lib. 8, cap. 6); and he says that he was much given to worldly pomp, which became his high station (vago fu molto della pompa mondana secondo suo stato—lib. 8, cap. 64; cfr. Muratori script. rer. italic. tom. XIII.)

through the crowd to the altar. This movement on the part of the people was regarded as something divine; or, if it took place naturally, still inasmuch as it had occurred, it was determined to make the best of it. The stories of a man over a hundred years old, who related what had been done at the beginning of the preceding century, added to the impression. Thereupon the pope put forth a bull, granting the fullest indulgence to all Romans who for thirty days, and to all strangers who for fifteen days, in this year, reckoning from the Easter festival, should devoutly visit the churches of St Peter and of St Paul in Rome; on the condition, however, carefully specified, that they truly repented and confessed their sins.[1] The expression used in the bull was, "the fullest forgiveness of sins," a promise which, thus vaguely expressed, was directly calculated to inspire many with a greater feeling of security in sin, as well as to encourage the abuse of indulgences. Attracted by this bull, vast multitudes of men and women, of all ages, from districts far and near, flocked together in Rome. In addition to the rest, the exhibition of the pretended handkerchief of St Veronica was employed as a powerful means of excitement. Two hundred thousand pilgrims a day are said to have assembled together in Rome—a source of great gain to the church, as well as of wealth to the Romans.

The unspiritual temper of this pope showed itself in the implacable hatred with which he persecuted his enemies. Thus he could not fail to place himself in the most unfavourable light to his contemporaries; while by other acts into which he allowed his passions to hurry him, he contributed to provoke the storms by which his reign was disturbed. When a cardinal, he was zealously devoted to the Ghibelline party; but no sooner had he become pope, than he turned into a fierce partisan of the Guelphs: and the wrath which he harboured against the former party exceeded all bounds. The following instance may be cited in illustration of his passionate spirit, which could profanely break forth on the most sacred occasions. We are told that on one occasion when sprinkling ashes, according to the usage on Ash-Wednesday, over the head of an archbishop of Genoa,

1 The words of the bull; Non solum plenam et largiorem, imo plenissimam suorum concedimus veniam peccatorum.

belonging to the Ghibellines, instead of reciting the words of the Psalm: "Memento quia cinis es et in cinerem reverteris," he travestied them, and said: "Quia Ghibellinus es, cum Ghibellinis in cinerem reverteris." Of a pope who could descend to such trifling, it is not difficult to account for the report which got abroad, and which was afterwards used against him, that his professions of reverence for the things of faith were wholly without sincerity.

At the head of his enemies stood the widely-branched and powerful family of the Colonnas, to which two cardinals belonged. These had opposed Boniface's election, and he therefore hated them. He gladly seized upon an opportunity that soon offered itself, to strike a blow at the whole family. A knight connected with it had attacked and plundered a convoy of the papal treasure on its way to Rome. He took this occasion to put forth, in the year 1297, against the entire family, a terrible bull, recounting all their sins, from distant generations to the present, deposing them from all their spiritual and secular offices, and pronouncing them under the ban. Their castles in Rome were demolished; their estates confiscated. This step was attended with very important consequences. The two cardinals of the family, who did not recognize the validity of the act by which they were deposed, published a protest[1] against Boniface and his proceedings. In this they endeavoured to prove that he was not to be considered as the lawful pope; for the pope, being a vicar of Christ, could not be deprived of his office by any one but God. Celestin was still, therefore, the only lawful pope, whose place could not rightly be filled by the substitution of another individual. But even supposing an abdication of this sort, made by a pope, were ever valid; it was not so in the case of Celestin, because it had been brought about by cunning and fraudulent management on the part of Boniface.[2] They appealed to a general council, to be convened for the purpose of settling this dispute, which so nearly concerned the well-being of the whole

1 Printed in the Appendix to Raynaldi Annales, year 1297, No. 34.

2 The noticeable words are: quod in renuntiatione ipsius multae fraudes et doli, conditiones et intendimenta et machinamenta et tales et talia intervenisse multipliciter asseruntur, quod esto, quod posset fieri renuntiatio, de quo merito dubitatur, ipsam vitiarent et redderent illegitimam, inefficacem et nullam.

church. Thus we see, first called forth by the wicked acts of this pope, an appeal to the higher tribunal of a general council, assembled to pass judgment on the pope;—an appeal, which, for the present indeed, met with no response,—but is still worthy of notice, as the first impulse towards calling into action a power in the church, which afterwards obtained an ascendancy so great, and so dangerous to papal absolutism. At this time, the regularity of Boniface's election was defended against the objections of the Colonnas by other persons in the service of the Roman court. Controversy with the pen was followed up by a bloody contest between the two parties. The pope used his spiritual power to gratify his personal animosities. He proclaimed a crusade against the Colonnas; and to take part in a war of revenge was made a condition of the pardon of sins. The Colonnas were compelled to yield to superior force. In the year 1298, they threw themselves at the pope's feet. He promised them forgiveness, and bestowed upon them absolution. But they found afterwards that they had been deceived by him. They again rebelled; and the pope renewed his sentence of excommunication. To secure safety to their persons, they fled from Italy. Several of their number betook themselves to France, where the pride of the pope soon gave them ample opportunity for revenge.

In King Philip the Fair of France, the pope found an antagonist quite his equal in avarice and ambition, and in that unflinching policy which never blushed at a crime, though in pursuit of opposite interests. When this king demanded that the spiritual order should, in common with all other classes, contribute money towards defraying the expenses of his wars, Boniface, who looked upon this as an encroachment on the liberties of the church, was induced, in the year 1296, to put forth a bull, known from its commencing words by the title, "Clericis laicos," and aimed against King Philip, though his name is not mentioned. In this bull, all princes and nobles were pronounced under ban, who demanded tribute, under any form, from the church and the clergy; and all who paid such tribute were involved in the same condemnation and penalty. Against this bull the king put forth a declaration, remarkable as containing the evidence of a more liberal spirit, in opposition to the Medieval Theocracy, a spirit which had never, indeed, ceased to propagate itself in opposition to papal

absolutism, and which was constantly emerging to the light whenever a favourable occasion presented itself; but the language we now hear employed partakes of a bold freedom, such as had not been heard for a long time. The church, it was said, does not consist of the clergy alone, but also of laymen. The liberty which Christ achieved for the faithful, freedom from the dominion of sin and of Satan, and from the yoke of the law, belongs not to the clergy alone, but also to the laity. Has Christ died and risen again solely for the clergy? God forbid. Is there such respect for persons with God, as that the clergy alone are to obtain grace in this life and glory in the life to come? No. To all alike who by faith and love bring forth the fruits of goodness has he promised the reward of eternal felicity; and the clergy, therefore, have no title to appropriate exclusively to themselves the ecclesiastical freedom that belongs to all, understanding thereby the freedom obtained for us by the grace of Christ. But from this universal freedom, are to be distinguished the special liberties which by the ordinances of the popes, the favour, or at least the sufferance of princes, have been bestowed on the ministers of public worship. Yet, by these liberties, kings ought not to be hindered in the government and defence of their realms; even as Christ said to the priests of the temple, that they should render to God the things that are God's, and to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. Have not those persons rendered in a perverted sense to God, who have sought to alter and distort the old and natural law according to their own caprice? What reasonable man must not be filled with astonishment at hearing that the vicar of Christ forbids the emperor to institute tribute; and with the threat of excommunication fulminates an order, that the clergy should not rally in support of the king, of the realm, nay, in defence of themselves against unjust attacks, according to their ability? Next, allusion is made to the worldly lives of the clergy; and it is objected to the pope, that he connived at this evil, while he prohibited ecclesiastics from fulfilling their duties to the civil powers. To squander away money, it is said, on theatrical exhibitions and worldly pleasures at the expense of the poor; to make extravagant expenditures for dress, for horses, for feasts and entertainments: all this is permitted them, as an example for corrupt imitation. But it was alike contrary to nature

and to reason, to divine law and to human, to be lavish in granting that which is not permitted, and eager to hinder that which is not only permitted, but even necessary. The king avowed his respect for the church and its ministers; but at the same time declared, that he did not fear the unreasonable and unrighteous threats of men.

This first quarrel was, it is true, soon afterwards hushed up, when the king accepted the mediation of the pope in settling his political strifes. In no long time, however, it broke out again with an increase of violence. Boniface complained of the manifold oppressions suffered by the church in France; and in the year 1301 set forth his grievances through a legate, who had already on a previous occasion made himself odious to the French government, and who by his character and his principles, which he avowed without reserve, was the very man to bring about a rupture which could not be healed. This was the bishop Saiset de Pamiers. He told the king, that although the seat of his bishopric came under French jurisdiction, yet, as a bishop he was not the king's subject, but amenable, in secular things as well as ecclesiastical, to the pope. He threatened the king with the ban, and his whole realm with the interdict. Unanswered and with contempt, the bishop was sent out of the kingdom. Soon, however, he ventured to appear again in his diocese. The consequence of his rebellious conduct was his arrest. It so happened, that the irascible pope, perhaps in the first outburst of wrath, sent a letter to the king, composed with dictatorial brevity, and commencing thus: "Thou art to know, that in things spiritual and temporal, thou art subject to us."[1] He told him, that the power of bestowing royal benefices depended solely on the pope; and he ended with these words: "Those who think otherwise, we hold to be heretics." This curt letter, instead of the usual apostolic salutation, bore for a superscription: "Deum time et mandata ejus observa." The style of this epistle might indeed suggest doubts with regard to its authenticity; but then again how much confidence is there to be placed in the passionate temper of a pope, who set no limits to his arbitrary will, and was not always mindful of decency. If it was attempted afterwards to deny the

1 Scire te volumus, quod in spiritualibus et temporalibus nobis subes.

official character of such a document, still it does not follow, that such a letter was not actually sent by the pope. There seems to have been no doubt on the subject in the very time of these events.[1]

To this letter the king returned as laconic an answer; with the address, "Philip, by the grace of God king of the French, to Boniface, who claims to be the Pope; little greeting, or rather none at all."[2] The letter began thus: "Let thy most consummate folly know, that in temporal things, we are subject to *no man*."[3] What Boniface had affirmed, was here as stoutly denied; and then to the card which Boniface had added, was thrown down another, quite its match. "Those who think otherwise we hold to be foolish or mad."[4]

Already were the boldest voices heard remonstrating against papal usurpations. In an opinion written upon this letter of the pope, in which it was designed to prove that the pope had, by making such assertions, fallen into a heresy, the king's advocate, Peter de Bosco, expressed himself as follows: The popes before the gift of Constantine, had lived in a condition of the greatest poverty. This gift was, at the beginning, not legally binding; and it might be revoked were it not for the many years that have since elapsed. But the most righteous punishment which a man can suffer is to ruin himself by his own actions; as Christ intimated when he said to Peter—"They who take the sword shall perish by the sword;" and perhaps it would be of advantage to the popes to become as poor as they once were, that they might be as holy. It would be better for them to enter the kingdom of heaven with the poor, than by pride, luxury, and rapine, to join company with those, who show by the fruits of their daily living, that they do not belong to the kingdom of heaven.

1 The language employed in vindication of the pope to be found among the transactions of the papal consistory in the year 1302, testifies in favour of the statement in the text. The document, after distinguishing this letter from the longer one hereafter to be mentioned, goes on to observe: Dicitur quod una alia litera fuit missa Domino regi, nescio unde venerit illa litera, sed scio quod per fratres sacri collegii *non fuit missa*, et excuso Dominum nostrum, quia credo firmiter, quod illam literam non misit, nec ab eo emanavit.—Histoire du differend d'entre le pape Boniface VIII et Philippe le Bel, roi de France. Paris 1655, p. 75.

2 Bonifacio se gerenti pro summo pontifice salutem modicam seu nullam.

3 Sciat Tua maxima fatuitas, in temporalibus nos alicui non subesse.

4 Secus autem credentes fatuos et dementes putamus.

If the pope be a servant of God, as he calls himself a *servant of the servants* of God, he should shun the mortal sins, robbery, luxury and pride; for Christ came not to destroy the law but to fulfil.[1]

The same day on which that shorter letter is said to have been despatched, on the 5th of December 1301, the pope sent a very long letter to the king.[2] In this he set forth in detail all the complaints against him and his government. He exhorts him to reform, threatening him, if he does not, with the worst; a step which he should take only with the greatest reluctance. Next he informs the king, that he intended to cite the most eminent men of the French church to Rome, to appear there by the first of November of the following year, for the purpose of advising with them as to the best method of removing the grievances above referred to, and of improving the administration of the realm. The king might either appear personally at Rome, or he might send agents invested with full powers; but at all events, he himself would not be induced, even should the king omit to do this, to alter his own conduct on that account. "But thou wilt observe"—says he—"what the Lord our God speaks forth in us."

Thus the pope set himself up as judge not only in ecclesiastical affairs, but also over the king's government; for he would have himself regarded, little as it suited with his character and his habits of life, a sort of theocratic umpire over all the affairs of the world: and so he says, following in this the example of other popes, that God had set him above kings and kingdoms, to pull down and build up. He warns the king against allowing himself to be persuaded by any one, that he had no superiors, that he was not subject to the head of the whole hierarchy; for whoever thought so was a fool; and whoever obstinately maintained it, showed that he was an infidel.[3]

The validity of such a bull, the king could not, of course, acknowledge without denying the sovereignty of his government, and making himself wholly dependant on the hierarchy. The

1 In the above cited Collection, p. 46.

2 Complete in the above cited collection of documents, p. 48; and with the omission of the passages expunged by order of Clement V., in Raynaldi 1301, No. 28

3 In the above cited Collection, p. 48.

bull was publicly burnt, and that it had been so disposed of, was everywhere announced by public proclamation.

The disputed principles according to which Boniface here acted, were also theoretically expounded by him, in a bull, constituting an epoch in church history, which from its commencing words is called "Unam Sanctam;" and the papal absolutism therein asserted was thus erected into a necessary article of faith. To be sure, this bull contains nothing more[1] than the logically consequent development of the principles on which the entire churchly theocratic system had rested since the time of Gregory VII., that Christ had committed to Peter two swords,—symbols of the spiritual, and of the secular authority. Both swords were dependant therefore on the church. The one was to be drawn *by* the church, the other *for* the church; the one by the hand of the priest, the other by the hands of kings and soldiers, but at the priests' behest. The secular power must needs, therefore, be subject to the spiritual; in correspondence to that law of divine order in the world, by which the lower is connected with that which is highest through various intermediate gradations; in proof of which the pope appeals to Dionysius the Areopagite. Whenever, therefore, the earthly power deviates from right, it must be corrected by the spiritual. Whenever an *inferior* spiritual power violates its duty, it can be corrected only by a *superior*, but the supreme authority can be corrected only by God. To supply a ground for this position, the words of Paul must be perverted; "He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man." The assertion that there are two powers subsisting independently of each other, is declared to be Manichæism.[2] That all men must obey the pope, is set forth as an article of faith necessary to salvation.[3]

This bull was considered in France an encroachment on the king's authority; a contrivance to make that authority dependant on the pope. The most emphatic protests were issued against it.

1 Vid. Raynaldi 1302, No. 13.

2 Nisi duo sicut Manichaeus fingat principia, quod falsum et haereticum esso judicamus; and against this Dualism, the beautiful reason that Moses did not say In principiis, but In principio coelum Deus creavit et terram.

3 Porro subesse Romano pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus e diffinimus omnino esse de necessitate salutis.

The grievances which the church had to suffer from the capricious exercise of papal authority were thereby brought into discussion. In the letter which the nobles of the realm and the bishops sent to the cardinals, complaints were made of the pope's bad government of the church, of the arbitrary methods of procedure in the distribution of benefices, whereby the churches were prostrated. It was said that foreigners, that boys, obtained the high offices of the church; that as such persons lived at a distance from the communities over which they were placed, and could not administer the office in person, the church service fell into neglect; the wishes of those who had founded the churches, were disregarded; the prelates were hindered from bestowing the benefices on well-informed clergymen of good standing.[1] The cardinals endeavoured to defend the pope against these complaints. Injustice enough there doubtless may have been on both sides; and the two parties may have had sufficient ground for mutual crimination. The pope could appeal to the fact, that a bishop also had instated two boys, his nephews. He had never heard, he says, when vindicating himself before the consistory of cardinals, that the king or a prelate had instated, as it behoved them to do, a master in theology; but he *had* heard of their instating their nephews, or other unqualified persons.

From the reproach also of having encroached upon the royal authority and its independent prerogatives, Rome endeavoured to clear herself. This conclusion could only have been arrived at, by a falsification or false interpretation of the pope's letter. "For forty years," says Boniface, "I have studied the law; and well know that two powers are ordained of God. Who then ought to believe, or can believe me guilty of such folly?"[2] And so too affirmed the cardinals. Never had the pope written to the king, that the latter had received from him the secular power, and that therein the king was subject to the pope.[3] But how is this to be reconciled with the principles expressed in the bull Unam Sanctam? To understand this we need only to see clearly into certain

1 See the letter of the barons in the above cited Collection, p. 61; the letter of the French church assembly to the pope, p. 60.

2 Quis ergo debet credere vel potest, quod tanta fatuitas tanta insipientia sit vel fuerit in capite nostro?

3 In the above cited Collection, p. 63.

distinctions of the papal law. It was very true that the spiritual and secular powers should subsist, each distinct and separate from the other; and yet, from the *moral* oversight of the pope nothing should be withdrawn; to his *moral* tribunal every thing must be amenable. And thus, what was conceded to the secular power with one hand is taken back by the other. By virtue of his moral tribunal the pope could still make every other power, which he acknowledged to be, in a certain respect, an independent one, dependant on himself. Thus, while he acknowledged this sort of relative independence, he might at the same time declare, that the king could no more than any other believer, deny, that he was still subject to the pope in respect of sins.[1] And accordingly, in that very consistory which was held for the purpose of vindicating the pope, the cardinal-bishop of Porto affirmed, "There is a ruler, a chief at the head of the church, whose commands all must obey." This ruler was lord over all, spiritual things and secular. It was a thing not to be doubted by any man, that in reference to sins, the pope had judicial authority over all things temporal. As God had created two luminaries, one to rule the day, the other the night, so had he conferred on the pope spiritual jurisdiction in the highest sense; on the emperor and princes, jurisdiction in temporal things; which is always to be understood, however, in its connection with the distinction above alluded to; the distinction between *right* and *practice*, as it is here called. It is asserted, that as certainly as Christ is to be judge over quick and dead, just so certainly this prerogative must also belong to his vicar, the pope. This was a part of the idea of the community of saints. Although the secular power, therefore, is not the pope's, as to practice, for Christ commanded Peter to return his sword into its sheath, still it should remain dependant on him, as to right. According to these principles Boniface acted, when he told the king, that if he did not reform, if he refused to let his prelates come to Rome, the pope would depose him, as his predecessors had already deposed three French kings. His arrogant language was, "The king who has done wickedness we will depose as if he was a boy."[2] What means the pope resorted to for

1 Non potest negare rex, seu quicunque alter fidelis, quin sit nobis subjectus ratione peccati.

2 Nos deponeremus regem sicuti unum garcionem

extending his dominion over all, we may gather from a boast of his, that he knew all the secrets of the French kingdom.

It is true, the king had straitly charged the French prelates not to leave the kingdom. The goods of those who obeyed the pope's citation were sequestrated; still Boniface required it of them that they should not be hindered by any fear of man from doing their duty. And on the 13th of April, 1303, he issued a bull, pronouncing the king under ban, because he had hindered the prelates from coming to the council at Rome, and oppressed in various ways those who did attend it, on their return home. When it had come to this, the king in the same year convoked an assembly of the estates, for the purpose of consulting with them as to what was to be done to counteract the plots of the pope, and secure against them the safety of the realm. On this occasion charges were brought against the pope in order to furnish ground for a protest against the legality of his government. These charges did not relate to simony alone, and to profane and worldly pursuits, but also to unnatural licentiousness, and to the grossest infidelity. It was said, for example, that Boniface denied the immortality of the soul, and often, before those with whom he was intimate, uttered such language as this: "You fools sillily believe a foolish thing! Who ever came back from the other world, to tell us anything about it? Happy they who know how to enjoy life; and pitiable creatures are those who lose the present life in hopes of gaining a future one, like the dog that stands over a pool of water with a bit of meat in his mouth, and seeing the reflected image of it, lets go the substance to chase after the shadow." He would often quote, it was said, the words of Solomon, "All is vanity! All will ever continue to be as it has been." If we could credit these accusations, we should have to set down Boniface as the most abominable of hypocrites; one who, believing nothing, used spiritual things merely as a means to promote his selfish ends; a man without any religion whatever, who, finding papal absolutism ready prepared for his purpose, wielded it for the gratification of his unhallowed passions; and hence was never restrained by any religious or moral scruples from abusing that power. It would be a remarkable sign of the times, if it were possible to find in his case an infidelity expressed with so much consciousness,—an

infidelity using superstition merely as a means and a pretext. As to what is said against the moral character of this pope, we certainly have no reason to question the truth of the testimony on that point; and in a man of so reckless a spirit, in a man so ready to use spiritual weapons to secure his own ends, the transition, it must be allowed, was a very easy one from superstition to absolute infidelity. But the accusations against the pope in relation to the matter of religion, proceeding from his most violent enemies, are not sustained by sufficient evidence. From the contradiction, which was so apparent between the life and conduct of Boniface and his spiritual vocation and religious professions, men might easily be led to conclude that the pope did not himself put faith in anything he said and did with a view to promote his own designs. Still, however, it is a remarkable sign, that such rumours should get into circulation respecting the religious opinion of *a pope*, however incredible many of the things may seem to be, of which this pope is accused. With regard to his moral character, the voice of his times is one and the same; not so with regard to the matter of religion. Even those who speak most unfavourably of Boniface take no part in accusing him on this point. The famous poet Dante, who certainly stood far enough removed from the papal party, also portrays Boniface as an altogether worldly minded man, one who profaned holy things. Yet he does not place him among the unbelievers, the deniers of immortality, in hell; as he does Frederic II., towards whom he must in other respects have been more favourably inclined, by virtue of his party interest, as a Ghibelline. This surely may be regarded as of some weight in estimating the credibility of those charges against the religious views of Boniface.

These charges having been formally set forth, it was now proposed that appeal should be made to a general council, before which they could be duly investigated. The proposition was adopted. The assembly appealed to a general council, and to a future lawful pope. Many spiritual and secular bodies united in this appeal, with the proviso that the pope should be allowed an opportunity of defending himself against such charges. Thus, for the second time, we are presented with the case of an appeal to a general council for the purpose of passing judgment on a pope.

The pope, of course, pronounced all these transactions disorderly, and unlawful. In opposition to these resolutions and appeals he put forth a bull, on the 15th of August, 1303. In this, he did not enter minutely into any refutation of the charges brought against his religious views, but simply says: "Where before had it ever been heard, that he was infected with heresies? Of what individual of his whole family, or of his province of Campania, could this be said? Whence then this so sudden change, that he who, but a short time ago, had been regarded by the king as lawful pope, should at once be accused as a heretic? No other reason could be assigned but this, that the pope had considered it his duty to call the king to account for wrongs he had done. A precedent then was now to be given, that whenever the successor of Peter should propose to correct a prince or powerful noble, he might be accused as a heretic, or a trangressor; and so reformation would be eluded, and the highest authority completely prostrated. "Far be it from me," he said, "without whom no council can be convoked, to permit any such precedent to be given." The pope pronounces every appeal from him to be null and void. He affirms that none superior or equal to him exists among mortals, to whom an appeal could be made; that without him, no council could be convoked; and he reserves it to himself to choose the fit time and place for proceeding against the king and his adherents and punishing such guilty excesses, unless they should previously reform, and give due satisfaction,—"so that their blood," says the pope, "may not be required at our hands."

The pope, with his cardinals, had retired to his native city Anagni; and already, on the 8th of September, 1303, had drawn up a new bull of excommunication against Philip, discharging all his subjects from their oath of allegiance and forbidding them any longer to obey him, when, before he could deal the blow, he fell himself a victim to the vengeance of his fiercest enemy. William of Nogaret, the French keeper of the seals, having been commissioned by the king to announce those resolutions to the cardinals and the pope, and to see them carried into execution, pushed forward, at the head of a troop of armed men, got together with the assistance of several of the banished Colonnas, and entered at early dawn into Anagni. The cry was raised,

"Death to Pope Boniface! long live the king of France!" The people took sides with the soldiers. The cardinals fled. The pope, forsaken by all, was surrendered as a victim into the hands of his enemies. He showed himself to be firm and courageous in misfortune; and we see plainly how much he might have accomplished, had his bold, energetic will been inspired by a single spark of religious or moral feeling. "Since," said he, "I am a prisoner by betrayal, like Christ, it becomes me to die, at least like a pope." On the papal throne, clad with all the papal insignia, he awaited his enemies. Nogaret took possession of the pope's person, and of his whole retinue. He descended to low abuse, and indulged himself in scandalous jokes on his prisoner. Boniface, who thought he had good cause to look out for poison, found himself reduced to the most deplorable condition. But three days had scarcely elapsed before a change took place in the fickle populace. They were seized with pity towards the forsaken Boniface, and indignation against those who had reduced him to this state. The multitude ran together, shouting, "Long live Boniface! death to his betrayers!" Thus the French were driven from the city, and Boniface, set at liberty, was enabled to return to Rome. But he did not escape the fate which he had drawn down on his own head. Mortified ambition and pride, as it would seem, threw him into a mental distemper, which terminated in insanity. He never got up from it, and died in this state on the 12th of October, 1303. On this unhappy end of Boniface, the Florentine historian, Villani,[1] judging according to the prevailing opinion of his age, makes the following comment: "We ought not to be surprised at the judgments of God in first punishing, after this manner, Pope Boniface, a man more worldly than became his station, and one who did much that was displeasing to God,—and then punishing him also who was employed as the instrument of the pope's punishment; not so much on account of his treatment of Boniface personally, as on account of his trespass against the Divine Majesty, of which the pope is the representative on earth."

This issue, in which a defence so conducted of papal absolutism pushed to the farthest extreme, resulted, was important not only

[1] Lib. 8. 63.

in itself, but also on account of the grave consequences to which it immediately led; the contest between the papal-court system of the Middle Ages and a more liberal tendency which gathered strength and boldness every day. As the first representatives of the latter appear, amidst these controversies, two distinguished writers,—the Augustinian *Aegidius of Rome*, afterwards archbishop of Bourges, and the Parisian Theologian *John of Paris*, a Dominican, of whom we have already spoken in the section relating to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, in the preceding period. The former composed, in the usual scholastic form, a controversial tract, in opposition to the pope's absolute authority, as asserted by Boniface in the above-mentioned shorter bull,—another evidence of the authenticity of that bull which ought not to be overlooked.[1]

From the fact that the pope was the vicar of Christ, it had been attempted to prove his universal authority; but in this tract the idea of such a vicarship was used for a directly contrary purpose. We here see the way already preparing for a tendency, which from this time forward appeared under various forms, and preceded the Reformation,—the tendency which aimed to set forth prominently the contrast between the pope as he was, and that which he ought to be as vicar of Christ. Although,—it is said,—Christ might have been Lord over all, yet he did not use this power. In fact, he declined the royal authority whenever it was offered to him, John vi. When the multitude would have made him king, he escaped from their hands, thereby teaching his followers to shun an insatiable covetousness, and restless ambition. Thus he spiritually gave example to his representatives on earth, that they should not covet imperial or royal honours, still less take upon themselves any such dignity. It was also to be reckoned as a part of the same lesson, that he refused to interfere in settling disputes about inheritance, Luke xii. "The Son of God ever disdained acting as a judge over temporal possessions, though ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead." Neither should his representatives, therefore, intermeddle with matters of temporal jurisdiction. Christ permitted neither Peter nor the

1 Quaestio disputata in utramque partem pro et contra potificiam potestatem. In Goldasti monarchia sacri imperii, tom. ii.

other apostles to exercise secular dominion; on the contrary, he constantly enjoined on them humility, and instead of secular power, recommended to them great poverty. They were to have neither gold nor silver. Aegidius appeals to the words of Peter in the Acts, "Silver and gold have I none." The apostles were to be spiritually minded; to withdraw themselves from earthly things, as far as human frailty permitted; to be absorbed in things spiritual and eternal; to watch over the welfare of souls. For Christ knew that temporal things ruffle the temper, distract the spirit, and sink it wholly in the world.

As to the question regarding the relation of the two powers to each other, Aegidius distinguishes the different classes of affairs. In matters purely spiritual, such as questions of matrimony, the secular power was undoubtedly subordinate to the spiritual. But with matters purely secular, such as feudal and criminal causes, the case stood otherwise. These things God had committed especially and directly to secular rulers; and with such, neither the popes nor any other prelates of the most ancient church had ever intermeddled.

The defenders of papal absolutism maintained, that the church, being one body, can have but one head; that a body with two heads would be a monster. To this he replied: Properly speaking, the church has assuredly but one head, which is Christ; and from him are derived the two powers, spiritual and temporal; yet, in a certain respect, the pope may be called head of the church, inasmuch as he is the first among the servants of the church—the one on whom the whole spiritual order depends. This conception of the papal power, as referring solely to that which is necessary or profitable to salvation, to ends purely spiritual, is ever kept distinctly in view by this writer.

The sophistical defenders of papal absolutism were disposed to find in the comprehension of all things in one unity under the pope as head over all, a restoration of that original state, in which Adam was the universal head. To this Aegidius answered: that the comparison did not apply; for in man's original condition, there could not have been states; and then again, all must have been spiritually-minded. There may have been, indeed, a certain rule of subordination, as there are different grades among the

angels; yet no such relation of rulers and subjects, as belongs to the idea of a state.

It had been a governing principle ever since the time of Gregory VII. that the pope could absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance; and from this it was inferred that his authority must extend also to temporal things. But Aegidius would concede the principle thus assumed, only under certain limitations. "The pope," says he, "can absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance, or rather declare that they are so absolved." By this latter clause, he doubtless meant to have it understood, that the pope cannot here express an arbitrary judgment, but only testify to a fact, or state that it had its real ground in the very nature of law itself. But this could be done only in those cases in which he was warranted also to take steps against a ruler; as in cases of heresy, of schism, or of obstinate rebellion against the Roman church.

The "plenitude of power" ascribed to the pope, a prerogative which the popes so often appealed to, as one which enabled them to carry through all their measures, Aegidius would allow to be valid only under certain limitations. It was valid only in reference to the souls of men; only in reference to the binding and loosing, and only on the presupposition that the pope's decision was not an erroneous one. He could not bestow renewing grace on souls; he could neither save nor condemn them; he could not forgive sins, except so far as he was the instrument of a higher power. Even in spiritual things, no such unconditional fulness of power was to be attributed to him; but only a fulness of power as compared with that of subordinate church authorities. It was an argument, indeed, often used, that as the spiritual is so far exalted above the temporal, therefore he who has supreme power over the spiritual, must *à fortiori* exercise that power over the temporal. Aegidius exposes the sophistry of this argument, by remarking that this mode of reasoning *a minori ad majus* was valid only as applied to matters the same in kind, and not to those differing in kind; else we might argue that he who can beget a man, can much more beget a fly: he who is a curer of souls, can much more cure the body.

Moreover, to the historical facts, which the defenders of an unlimited papacy construed so as to accord with their own interests,

this writer assigned their legitimate place; as, for example, to the deposition of Childeric III. by pope Zacharias. "It is nowhere read," says Aegidius, "that the pope deposed him, but only that he advised to that step. It was by the estates of the realm that Childeric was deposed, and Pipin proclaimed in his place; but they could have done the same thing without the pope's advice."

The second of the above mentioned individuals, John of Paris, in his treatise of Royal and Papal authority,[1] speaks of two errors, which he represents as running into opposite extremes; the opinion of the Waldenses, that the pope and prelates ought not to exercise secular dominion of any kind; and the opinion of those who considered Christ's kingdom an earthly one. Of these latter, he points to Herod I. as the representative; for when he heard that Messiah the King was born, he could conceive of nothing but an earthly king. "Just so," he says, "in modern times, many in trying to avoid the error of the Waldenses, fall into the opposite extreme of considering the pope to be vicar of Christ, as having dominion over the earthly goods of princes, and of ascribing to him such a jurisdiction." This doctrine, he thinks, would lead to the error of Vigilantius; for it would follow from it, that renunciation of earthly power and earthly rule contradicted the vocation of the pope as vicar of Christ; whence, again, it would follow, that such renunciation was no part of evangelical perfection. This opinion seems to him to savour somewhat of the pride of the Pharisees, who taught that if the people paid tythes and offerings to God, they were under no obligation to pay tribute to Cæsar. He describes it as dangerous, because it removes the right of property which they previously possessed from such as are converted to Christianity, and transfers it to the pope. It would reflect discredit on the Christian faith, which would thus seem to stand in conflict with social order; and it was to be feared that when traffic thus found entrance into the house of God, Christ would lay hold of the scourge to purify the temple. The truth, however, was represented as lying in the middle between these two errors. It was this, that secular rule and worldly possessions were in no wise inconsistent with the calling of the pope or the prelates; but still they were in no respect necessarily implied in that vocation; but were only permissible, and might be

[1] De potestate regia et papali, in the above cited Collection of Goldast. tom. ii.

used, when bestowed either by the devotion of Christians or from any other quarter.

In separating the two powers, the author makes use of that distinction between the natural and supernatural destination of man, of which we spoke in giving the history of scholastic theology in the preceding period. Answering to the one, is the realization of the end which the State proposes, by means of the natural virtues; for this object civil government is instituted. Answering to the other, is the destination to life eternal; and for this the spiritual power has been established. Both powers are derived immediately from the supreme, divine power. And he, like Aegidius, refutes the argument, that because one is a superior, the other an inferior province, the latter must therefore be subject to the former. The priest, in spiritual things, was greater than the prince; but in temporal things, the prince was greater than the priest; though absolutely considered, the priest was the greater of the two. It is maintained that the pope has no power of control even over the goods of the church. These were bestowed by certain individuals, who gave them to the church in behalf of the ecclesiastical commonwealth, for the furtherance of its ends; to this commonwealth alone they belonged. The administration of this trust devolved solely on the prelates, and the pope had the general direction of this administration. Hence he concludes that the pope could in no wise dispose of the goods of the church at will, so that whatever he should ordain about them must be obligatory; but the power conferred on him related simply to the wants or to the advantage of the universal church. As a monastery could deprive its abbot, a particular church its bishop, if it was proved that the former squandered the goods of the monastery, the latter the property of the church, so too the pope, if found guilty of any such unfaithful administration, and if, after being admonished, he did not reform, might be deposed: whereupon he adds, "But, according to the opinion of others, this could *only* be done, perhaps, by a general council." John of Paris cites a doctrine held forth by the advocates of papal absolutism, that even though one rightfully opposed the arbitrary will of the pope in the administration of church property, still the latter might remove him from his office. He says, on the other hand, "They lift their mouths against heaven, and do foul

wrong to the pope, who thus make his will a disorderly, arbitrary will, when it is to be presumed that the will of so great a father can never be so in conflict with justice, as that he should, without good and sufficient reasons, take away his own from any one; for God never takes from any one that which he has given him, except for his own fault. As the government of Christ is not a worldly one, so he maintained the vicarship of the pope could not relate to the things of the world. Christ rules in the faithful, only through that which is highest in them, through the spirit which has submitted to the obedience of faith. His kingdom is a spiritual one, having its foundation in the hearts of men, not in their possessions.

We have seen, that by the advocates of papal absolutism, a distinction was made between the secular power in itself, and in its exercise; so that the former was held to proceed immediately from the pope, but the latter to depend wholly upon the sovereigns, to have been conferred by God on them alone. This distinction John of Paris declares to be absurd and inconsistent. It would follow from it, says he, that the princes were also called upon to judge how the pope exercised his power, and that they might deprive him of it; which, however, is denied by these men when they assert that the pope can be judged by no man. And how is the pope to receive from princes what does not belong to him by the ordinance of God? and how is he to give them what he himself receives from them? The princes, according to this doctrine, would be servants of the pope, as the pope is the servant of God, which contradicts what is said in Rom. xiii., about magistrates being ordained of God. Moreover, the power of rulers was, as a matter of fact, both in itself and in its exercise, prior in time to the power of the pope.

He also stood up in defence of the independent power of the bishops and priests, and denied that this was derived from God only through the mediation of the pope, maintaining, that it springs directly from God, through the choice or concurrence of the communities. For it was not Peter, whose successor is the pope, that sent forth the other apostles, whose successors are the bishops; or who sent forth the seventy disciples, whose successors are the parish priests; but Christ himself did this directly. It was not Peter who detained the apostles in order to impart to

them the Holy Ghost; it was not he who gave them power to forgive sins; but Christ. Nor did Paul say, that he received from Peter his apostolical office; but he said that it came to him directly from Christ or from God; that three years had elapsed after he received his commission to preach the Gospel, before he had an interview with Peter.

He maintains again, that ecclesiastical jurisdiction has reference solely to things spiritual. The most extreme penalty which the pope could threaten was excommunication; all else was but a consequence accidentally connected with that penalty. Thus he could only operate indirectly, so that the person on whom he pronounced sentence of excommunication for some offence coming under his jurisdiction, might be deposed, in case he threatened to put under ban all who should obey him as sovereign, and thus brought about his removal by means of the people. But similar to this, was the relation of rulers also to the pope, considered with reference to the particular provinces of their power. If the pope gave scandal to the church, and showed himself incorrigible, it was in the power of secular rulers to bring about his abdication or his deposition by means of their influence on him or on his cardinals. And if the pope would not yield, the emperor might so manage as to compel him to yield. He might command the people, under severe penalties, to refuse obedience to him as pope. Thus both pope and emperor could proceed one against the other; for both had a general jurisdiction, the emperor in temporal, the pope in spiritual things. At the same time he expressly declares, that all he had said respecting this power of the pope over princes could relate only to such things as came under spiritual jurisdiction; such as matters relating to the marriage-covenant, and matters of faith. But when a king violated his obligations, as a ruler, it was not in the pope's power to correct this evil directly. All that he could do was to apply to the estates of the realm; but if these could not or dared not correct their sovereign, they were authorized to invoke the assistance of the church. So on the other hand, if the pope transgressed in temporal things, the investigation of which belonged to the civil jurisdiction, the emperor had a right first to correct him by admonition, and then to punish him, by virtue of his authority as a minister of God to execute wrath on evil doers. Rom. xiii.

But if the pope did wrong in spiritual things, if he committed simony, encroached on the rights of the church, taught false doctrines, he ought first to be set right by the cardinals, standing, as they did, at the head of the clerus. But if he proved incorrigible, and they had not the power to rid the church of the scandal, they were bound to invoke the assistance of the secular arm, and the emperor might employ against the pope the powers which God had put into his hands. He refers, for an example, to the deposition of Pope John XII. by the Emperor Otho I. When the defenders of papal absolutism took the passage in the first epistle to the Corinthians, and perverted it to their purpose, "He that is spiritual judgeth all things, but he himself is judged of no man," he replied: "The passage has no such application, for the apostle is only speaking of persons spiritually minded; but the possessor of the spiritual power is not always such a person. Furthermore, he asserts that the unity of the church, as one spiritual body, is not founded on Peter or on Linus, but on Christ, who *alone* is in the proper and highest sense the head of the church; from whom are derived the two powers, in a certain series of gradations; yet the pope might, in reference to the outward service of the church, be called head of the church; inasmuch as he is the first among her servants, the one on whom, as the first vicar of Christ in spiritual things, the whole regular series of church ministers depends. He disputes the binding force of the pretended gift of Constantine to Pope Silvester. He declares this gift a preposterous one; and cites a legend, frequently alluded to by the opponents of the papacy, that at the time of this gift the voice of an angel was heard saying, To-day a vial of poison has been poured upon the church.

John of Paris finally enters into a particular investigation of the question whether the pope can be deposed, or can abdicate. What conclusions he must have arrived at on this point, may be gathered from the preceding remarks. He distinctly affirmed, that as the papacy existed only for the benefit of the church, the pope ought to lay down his office whenever it obstructed this end, the highest end of christian love.

Such were the most noticeable of the immediate consequences resulting from the high pretensions set up for the papal power by Boniface VIII. We see expressed here for the first time, in

opposition to the arbitrary will of the pope, principles, by the operation of which, in the midst of the events with which this century closed, a new shaping could not fail to be given to the laws and constitutions of the church.

The successor of Boniface, a very different man from himself, was *Benedict* XI., a Dominican, who, up to this time, had lived strictly according to the rule of his order. As a pope, too, he showed a becoming zeal for the welfare of the church, and sought to correct the evils occasioned by the arbitrary will of his predecessor. He did everything he could honourably do, to restore a good understanding with the French government. But it was only for the short period of eight months that he was permitted to rule. He died in 1304; and a report prevailed that he was poisoned by the cardinals;[1] a noticeable sign of the times, when reports like these—a similar one prevailed about the death of Celestin V.—were so repeatedly noised abroad. A great fermentation would necessarily ensue at the election of a new pope. It was known that the exasperated king of France still cherished sentiments of revenge against Boniface VIII., and was determined to have him convicted and condemned, as a heretic, even after his death. The party of Boniface had to strain every nerve to vindicate his honour. Thus the election of a pope was retarded by the contest between an Italian party, devoted to the interests of Boniface, and a French party. Nine months had this schism lasted, when the cunning and sagacious cardinal da Prato (du Prat), who led the French party, proposed a plan by which they might come together and unite in a choice. The other party, the Italians, should nominate three candidates from their own number, and out of these one should be chosen by the French within forty days. The Italian party doubtless thought themselves secure of the victory, for they selected three men, who had been elevated to the rank of cardinals by Boniface VIII., to whom they were thoroughly devoted, and, at the same, fiercely inimical to the king of France. But the cardinal du Prat outwitted them. He knew his men. He knew how to find among the selected three, one who was ready to pay any price that might be asked for the gratification of his ambition. This was

1 See Villani, lib. 8, cap. 80.

Bertrand d'Agoust, bishop of Bordeaux, who was reckoned among the most zealous adherents of Boniface, and the most violent enemies of king Philip. With the latter he had had a personal quarrel. The cardinal du Prat reported to the king of France, as speedily as possible, all that had transpired, and explained to him how it now stood in his own power to create the pope. He might offer the papal dignity to the archbishop of Bordeaux on whatever terms he thought proper. The king sought an interview with the much surprised bishop. He showed him what he could do. He offered him the papal dignity on condition of his compliance with six conditions. Among them were the following: That he should reconcile the king and his friends to the church; pardon everything that had taken place; give up to him for five years the tenths in his whole kingdom to defray the expenses of war; restore to the Colonnas their cardinal dignities; moreover, that he should promote several of the king's friends to the same rank, and institute an investigation into the heresies of Boniface. There was still a sixth condition which, for the present, was to be kept a profound secret. Perilous as several of these conditions must have been to the papal and christian conscience of the pope, yet he was ready to sell his soul for the papal dignity, and he accepted them all. This was done in the year 1305. He called himself pope Clement V. To the great vexation of the Italian cardinals he did not come to Rome, but remained at home in France, and had the ceremony of his coronation performed in Lyons. The way in which he administered the papal government, corresponded entirely to the way in which he had obtained it. What the Italians had predicted, when the pope, in despite of every invitation, refused to leave France, actually took place. Rome did not very soon again become the seat of the papacy. From the year 1309 and onward this seat was transferred to Avignon; and here begins a new important epoch in the history of the papacy, *the seventy years' residence of the popes in Avignon*. Let us in the first place take a general view of the consequences of these exceedingly influential events.

As the independence of the seat of the papal government in the ancient capital of the world had largely contributed towards promoting the triumph of the papacy; so the dependence, into

which the popes fell when removed at a distance from the ancient seat of their spiritual sovereignty, led to consequences of an opposite kind. With Clement V. began this disgraceful servility of popes dependant on the interests of France; a situation for which Clement had prepared the way by the manner in which he obtained the papal dignity. The popes at Avignon were often little better than tools of the French kings, who used their spiritual power to promote the ends of French policy. They served those kings in matters which stood in most direct contradiction to their spiritual vocation. They could not fail to make themselves odious and contemptible by the manner in which they acted in these relations. The papal court at Avignon became the seat of a still greater corruption than had disgraced the papal court in Rome. The popes at Avignon took the liberty to elevate to the highest spiritual dignities, to the rank of cardinals, persons the least fitted by age, by character, or by education for such stations,—the most worthless of men, either their own nephews, or persons recommended to them by the French court; and these Avignonese cardinals were in the habit of abandoning themselves to every species of luxury and debauchery. The extortions which, to the ruin of the church, were practised by the Roman court, rose to a continually higher pitch and extended over a greater compass, from the time of Clement V., who already provoked thereby many complaints in France. The example of a wasteful expenditure of church property, of simony and cupidity, here given by the popes, found ready imitation in other churches, and the corruption of the church in all parts grew more atrocious every day. The popes at Avignon would abate nothing from the old system of the papal hierarchy, but rather pushed its pretensions to still greater lengths. But the want which they betrayed of spiritual dignity, the bad use they made of their power, the merely secular interest by which they were so manifestly governed, stood in direct contradiction with the tone in which they spoke. The quarrels in which they involved themselves by their exercise of the papal power, brought it about, that all the wickedness which reigned in the papal court at Avignon, and which spread from that spot into the rest of the church, became matter of common conversation. These quarrels served to call forth many more of those voices of freedom, such

as had first been heard during the contests with Boniface VIII.; and still bolder opinions were expressed. A powerful reaction gradually forced a way for itself against the papal monarchy. Add to this, that the freer churchly spirit, which from the earliest times we perceive in the Gallic church, and which was never in want for means of expressing itself, obtained at this particular crisis a mighty organ in the university of Paris. At this university, which in the period before us formed so important a corporation, there was gradually developing itself an independent and liberal theological tendency. By the men of this university, the conduct of the popes and their relations at Avignon, were keenly watched. The popes found severe judges in them. While the French cardinals could not tear themselves away from their pleasures at Avignon, and from the territory of France, nothing was more hateful to the Italian cardinals than what appeared to their eyes, a most lamentable exile of the Roman court. Nothing appeared to them a greater scandal, than that dependance on French interests. This opposition between the two parties prepared the way for a schism, which was soon to break out, and which drew after it the most important consequences.

Clement had soon to experience some of the deplorable effects resulting from the relation, in which he had voluntarily placed himself to king Philip. After the death of the emperor Albert I., in the year 1308, King Philip conceived the plan of elevating his brother, Prince Charles de Valois, to the imperial throne; and the pope was to serve as the instrument for carrying it into execution. This, it was said, was the condition that had been kept so profound a secret. The king intended to take the pope by surprise, to come upon him suddenly, with a numerous train of armed followers. But the plan was divulged to the pope. As the Italian historian in this period, Villani, expresses himself:— "It pleased God, so to order it, that the Roman church should not thus be wholly subjected to the Court of France;"[1] for, had this project been carried out, the servitude of the pope would have been doubled. Now, as the pope had not courage enough to take an open stand against the king, he resorted, by the advice of the crafty du Prat, to trick and deception, for the purpose of

[1] Come piacque a Dio, per non volere che la Chiesa di Roma fosse al tutto sottoposta alla casa di Francia. Villani, lib. 8, c. 101, fol. 437.

defeating the king's object. While he ostensibly granted the king's request, he secretly invited the German princes to hasten the emperor's election, and gave his vote for Count Henry of Luxemburg. The latter, Henry VII., was elected emperor; and Philip saw his favourite plan defeated. He now pressed the more urgently to have the process begun against Boniface. The weak pope was obliged to permit that, in the year 1310, the matter should be brought before the papal consistory. By the enemies of Boniface the most atrocious things were charged against him. This, under the existing circumstances, could not fail to give great scandal to many. From several quarters, particularly from Arragon and Spain, complaints were uttered against so scandalous a spectacle; and the pope was called upon to put a stop to it. Under the pretext that a general council was to be convoked at Vienne, and that there these affairs could be transacted with far greater publicity and solemnity, he induced King Philip, finally, to consent that the affair should be put off to the above-mentioned council. At this council in Vienne, which met in the year 1311, the memory of Boniface was at length solemnly vindicated. But the pope, moreover, put forth a declaration placing the king in security against all the consequences which might flow from his acts against Boniface, and, from the bulls put forth by Boniface, all those clauses were expunged or altered, which were hostile to French interests.

At the council of Vienne was terminated also another affair in which Clement had, in the most shameful manner, submitted to be used as a tool of the French king. The order of the *Knights Templar* had, by the power and wealth of their establishments, excited the jealousy of many. Various rumours were afloat respecting this order,—rumours which are the less to be trusted, because we find in times the most widely remote from each other similar reports concerning societies veiled from the popular eye, and which in some way or other have incurred the popular odium —whispers of unnatural abominations, supposed to be practised in their secret conclaves. Persons of that order guilty of criminal offences, had, while in prison, preferred charges against it, with a view to procure their own release. King Philip the Fair would, no doubt, be glad to believe anything which would put it in his power to lay hold of the property of the order. In the year 1307,

he caused all the Knights Templar in France to be arrested. The trials were conducted in the most arbitrary manner. At first, the pope complained that the king should bring before a civil tribunal a suit against a spiritual order, accusations relating to heresy and infidelity. He entered a protest against the procedure of the king; but had not courage to follow up the step he had taken. At length, in the year 1308, he joined the king in carrying on a common process. There has been much dispute respecting this affair. But even though individuals of the order may have been guilty of various excesses, may by reason of their residence in the East, have fallen into infidelity, yet no sufficient reason appears to have existed for condemning the order at large. Expressions, for the most part extorted by the rack, and which were often taken back in the extremity of death, ought not, surely, to pass for good evidence. Indeed, when justice is so arbitrarily administered, what evidence of guilt can be deemed satisfactory? Now, when many of the Knights Templar had already fallen victims to mere tyrannical will, Clement, at a council in the year 1311, declared the order abolished. Clement died in 1314, leaving behind him a bad reputation, not merely among the Italians, who could not pardon in him the transportation of the papal court to Avignon, but also among the French. The judgment passed upon him we may doubtless regard as an unanimous one.[1] The Italian historian, Villani, says of him, that he was very greedy of money, given to simony, and to luxury. Respecting his morals, unfavourable rumours were afloat. All benefices were said to be disposed of for money.[2]

When, owing to the division among the cardinals, the papal chair had remained vacant during a period of two years, the French party once more triumphed, and John XXII., another Frenchman, succeeded in mounting the papal throne. Like his predecessor, this pope was bent on indemnifying himself for his dependance on France, by maintaining the papal absolutism in relation to Germany. On the occasion of a contest for the election of an emperor—between the Archduke Frederic of Austria on the one side, and Duke Louis of Bavaria on the other—

1 Compare the two accounts of his life which Baluz has published in the vit. pap. Avign. tom. i., and what Villani says.

2 Villani, lib. 9, c. 58.

the pope was desirous of securing the decision to himself. He wanted that everything should depend on *his* vote. He would not pardon it in Duke Louis (Louis IV.) that he should be so confident of his power, as to act as emperor, without waiting for the pope's determination : that he should form an alliance with the pope's enemies, the Ghibellines in Italy. Negotiations were of no avail. The matter proceeded onward till it came to a war of ever increasing animosity between the pope and the emperor. The former pronounced the emperor under ban, in denunciations growing continually more violent, and laid all those portions of Germany where he was recognized as emperor, under the interdict. The emperor appealed from the pope to a general council, before which he might be allowed to prove the justice of his cause to holy church and the apostolical see. Fierce struggles in Germany followed as the consequence ; and amid these contests many freer voices caused themselves to be heard. By some the interdict was observed ; by others not. In many districts, ecclesiastics, who were for observing the interdict, were banished.[1] The emperor, in the year 1327, followed the invitation of his friends in Italy and Rome, the Ghibellines, who invited him into that country. This expedition of the emperor was attended with consequences of great moment to the general progress of religion. Pope John had provoked dissatisfaction in many, and these took the side of the emperor. Under his protection, free-minded men could express themselves in a way which elsewhere would not have been suffered to go unpunished. Various matters of dispute were here brought together, and placed in connection with the contest which was now waging between the papacy and the empire, the church and the secular power, the spiritual and the secular interest. We have, in the preceding period, spoken of the controversies

1 See the Chronicle of the Franciscan John of Winterthur: Et interim clerus gravitur fuit angariatus et compulsus ad divina resumenda, et plures annuerunt, non verentes latam sententiam, nec ultionem divinam. Multi etiam erant inobedientes, et ob hoc de locis suis expulsi, et sic tandem facta fuit lamentabilis difformitas ecclesiarum. And of the churches that mutually accused each other of heresy on account of their different modes of procedure: Illae mutuo se sinistrè judicabant, mutuo sibi non communicabant, sed frequenter se excludebant, unaquæque suo sensu secundum verbum apostoli quasi dicam abundabat. Thesaur. hist. helvit. Tiguri, 1735, p. 29.

between the more rigid and the laxer party of the Franciscans. We saw how the more rigid Franciscans, in their contests with the popes, had been led into a course of reaction against the secularization of the church. Pope John XXII., who, with his obstinate temper, was bent on deciding all uncertain matters, had stirred up these controversies anew, by taking part against the more rigid Franciscans. He refused to recognize a distinction set forth by some, that while Christ and the apostles *made use* of earthly goods, they did not in any proper sense *own* anything—the distinction between a bare *usufruct*, and an earthly possession in the strict and proper sense. The more rigid Franciscans rebelled against his decisions, and even had the boldness to accuse him of heresy. There were among them at that time men of courage and sagacity, such as Michael of Chesena, general of the order, who was deposed by the pope; William Occam of England, distinguished among the philosophers and theologians of his time. All these embraced the party of the emperor. Occam said to him: "Defend me with the sword, and I will defend you with the pen." The inquiries respecting evangelical perfection, respecting the following after Christ, the different modes of the possession of property, were easily connected with the inquiries respecting the relation of spiritual things to secular in general. Especially worthy of notice is a work which was called forth by these disputes, the title of which indicates its contents—*Defensor Pacis*. Its object was to show that, inasmuch as church and state had their natural limits severally assigned to them, the peace between the two should thereby be definitively settled. Its author was the emperor's physician and theologian, Marsilius of Padua, earlier rector of the University of Paris. It is true, John of Janduno, in Champagne, a Franciscan, is also mentioned as co-author of this book; and doubtless he may have had some share in its composition; but at all events, the work itself indicates plainly enough that it is the product of one mind, and of an individual who speaks of what he had seen and heard himself. It is in truth a work that made an epoch. Not merely the excesses of the later papacy are attacked in it, but the very foundations of the hitherto existing fabric of the church are assailed.

A new position is here taken—an entirely new method and way

of looking at Christian truth. The whole Old Testament theocratical element is discarded. This important appearance, the fore-token of a new, protestant spirit, such as we could hardly expect to meet with in the times we are speaking of, deserves, therefore, to be somewhat more minutely considered by us.

The rock on which the Church reposes he holds to be Christ alone, its author and founder.[1] The words of Christ, "Upon this rock I will build my church," he refers to Christ himself. In reply to those who supposed that the church, destitute of a visible head, would be in want of something essential to its organization, just as if it were a body without a head, he says: "Christ ever continues to be the head of the church, all apostles and ministers of the church are but his members;" and he appeals in proof to Ephesians iv. And accordingly Christ himself plainly said, that he would be with her to the end of the world.[2] The highest source of knowledge of the doctrines of faith was, in his view, the holy Scriptures.[3] "By the apostles," says he, "as organs immediately actuated and guided by divine power, the precepts and counsels guiding to eternal salvation have been committed to writing, that in the absence of Christ and the apostles we might know what they are."[4] The author takes his point of departure from a more sharply defined distinction of the ideas of church and state. The idea of the state he takes from an ante-Christian point of view, inasmuch as he adopts the Politics of Aristotle, the standard authority at that time, for the determination of such ideas. The state is a society of men having reference to the *earthly* life and its interests;[5] the church, a society having refer-

1 Qui caput est et petra, super quam fundata est ecclesia catholica. He refers for proof to the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and 1 Cor. x. See p. 246, cap. 17, in Goldasti monarchia Roman. imp. Francofurt. 1668, tom. ii.

2 Et cum inducebatur, ecclesiam acephalam esse, neque fuisse ordinatam a Christo secundum optimam dispositionem, si eam absque capite in sui absentia reliquisset, possumus dicere, quod Christus semper caput remansit ecclesiae, omnesque apostoli et ecclesiastici ministri membra. L. l. p. 301.

3 A sacro canone tanquam a fonte veritatis quaesitæ facientes exordium, cæt. L. l. pag. 252.

4 Per ipsorum dictamina conscripta sunt velut per organa quaedam ad hoc mota et directa immediate divina virtute, per quam siquidem legem, præcepta et consilia salutis æternae in ipsius Christi atque apostolorum absentia, comprehendere velemus. L. l. p. 168.

5 Vivere et bene vivere mundanum, ac quae propter ipsum necessaria sunt. L. l. p. 168.

ence to the *eternal* life; where we find expressed the relation of the natural to the supernatural, answering to a distinction already noticed between the dona *naturalia* and *super-addita*. The state became necessary in order to counteract sin. Had man continued loyal to the divine will, no such institution would have been required.[1] He finds the difference between the Old and the New Testament dispensation to consist in this, that under the former, civil laws as well as religious were made known and sanctioned by divine authority. But Christ had kept all these matters in abeyance. He had left them to be settled by human laws, which all the faithful should obey. He refers for proof to the words of Christ, " Give to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," and to Romans xiii.[2] To the assertion that the gospel would be an imperfect dispensation if civil relations could not also be ordered and settled by means of it; he replies, the two provinces ought clearly to be distinguished. The evangelical law is sufficient for its specific end, which is to order the actions of men in *this present* life so as to secure the life *eternal*. It was not given for the end of determining law in reference to the relations of this earthly life. It was for no such end that Christ came into the world. Hence the necessity of distinguishing different rules of human conduct by their relation to different ends. One is a divine rule which gives no instruction whatever about conducting suits in civil law, and actions for recovery; nor yet, does it forbid this. And for this reason the gospel gives no particular precepts with regard to such matters. This belongs to the province of human law. He refers for illustration to the conduct of Christ in declining to act as an arbitrator in the dispute concerning an inheritance.[3] If any were disposed to call the evangelical law an

1 In reference to man's primitive state: in quo siquidem permansisset, nec sibi aut suae posteritati necessaria fuisset officiorum civilium institutio vel distinctio. P. 161.

2 Mosi legem Deus tradidit observandorum in statu vitae praesentis, ad contentiones hominum dirimendas, praecepta talium specialiter continentem, et in hoc proportionaliter se habentem humanae legi quantum ad aliquam sui partem. Verum hujusmodi praecepta in evangelica lege non tradidit Christus, sed tradita vel tradenda supposuit in humanis legibus quas observari et principantibus secundum eas omnem animam humanam obedire praecepit, in his saltem, quae non adversarentur legi salutis. P. 215.

3 Quod per legem evangelicam sufficienter dirigimur in agendis aut declinandis in vita praesenti, pro statu tamen venturi saeculi seu aeternae salutis consequendae, aut

imperfect one, because no rules were to be drawn from it for the regulation of these matters, they might, with equal propriety, call it imperfect, because the principles of the healing art, the doctrines of mathematics, or the rules of navigation were not to be derived from it.[1]

We have already remarked that Marsilius looked upon the holy Scriptures as constituting alone the ultimate source of all our knowledge of the Christian faith; to them alone as contradistinguished from all human writings, he ascribes infallibility.[2] Yet it was his opinion that the holy Scriptures would have been given in vain, nay would have proved an injury to mankind, if the doctrines necessary to salvation could not be derived from them with certainty. Hence it followed that Christ would clearly reveal these doctrines to the majority of the faithful, when they searched after the true sense of the holy Scriptures and invoked his assistance; so that the doctrine drawn from the holy Scriptures by the majority of believers in all times, ought to be the rule for all. And hence he concluded that the highest respect was due to the decisions of general councils.[3] For proof of this he appealed to Christ's promise, that he would be with his church to the end of the world, and to the fact that the first apostolic assembly, Acts xv., ascribed their decisions to the illumination of the Holy Ghost. But he dissented from the well-known maxim of St Augustine, Ego vero evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas; since by this expression the

supplicii declinandi propter quae lata est, non quidem pro contentiosis actibus hominum civiliter reducendis ad aequalitatem aut commensurationem debitam pro statu seu sufficientia vitae praesentis, eo quod Christus in mundum non venit ad hujusmodi regulandos pro vita praesenti, sed futura tantummodo. Et propterea diversa est temporalium et humanorum actuum regula, diversimode dirigens ad hos fines. P. 216.

1 Si ex hoc diceretur imperfecta, aeque convenienter imperfecta dici posset, quoniam per ipsam medicare corporales aegritudines, aut mensurare magnitudines, vel oceanum navigare nescimus. L. c.

2 Quod nullam scripturam irrevocabiliter veram credere vel fateri tenemur de necessitate salutis aeternae, nisi eas, quae canonicae appellantur. F. 254, c. 19.

3 Quoniam frustra dedisset Christus legem salutis aeternae, si ejus verum intellectum, et quem credere fidelibus est necessarium ad salutem, non aperiret eisdem hunc quaerentibus, et pro ipso invocantibus simul, sed circa ipsum fidelium pluralitatem errare sineret. Quinimo talis lex non solum ad salutem foret inutilis, sed in hominum aeternam perniciem tradita videretur. Et ideo pie tenendum, determinationes conciliorum generalium in sensibus scripturae dubiis a spiritu sancto suae veritatis originem sumere. Cap. 19, fol. 254.

authority of the sacred Scriptures seemed to be ultimately based on human authority. But his interpretation of these words evidences the freer christian striving of his mind, although the position reached by the theological culture of that period did not permit him as yet to arrive at clearer and more comprehensive views on this subject. These words were represented as simply having reference either to the fact, that it is by the testimony of the church we come to know that these Scriptures are apostolical, or also, and at the same time, to the fact, that we adopt the doctrines therein contained as the doctrines of salvation first of all upon the testimony of the collective body of believers. The former view, however, he thought to be the one which accorded best with St Paul's teachings in the epistle to the Galatians; for the words of Christ were not true on the ground that the church gave witness to them, but the testimony of the church was true, because it harmonized with the words of Christ; for the apostle Paul says, not even an angel from heaven could preach any other gospel; so that although the entire church should preach another gospel, it could not be a true one.[1]

He objected to the arbitrary extension of the predicate *spiritual* to everything that appertained to, or proceeded from the clergy. Whatever served for the maintenance of the clergy was not on that account, according to holy Scripture, to be called spiritual, since it related simply to the earthly life; but it should be called secular. In truth, many things were done by the clergy, which could not, with any propriety, be called spiritual.[2] As might easily be inferred from the exposition we have just given of his ideas of the church and the state, he ascribed to the church a purely spiritual authority only; and denied that she possessed any authority whatever of a secular character, or which had reference to things secular. He disclaimed for her the possession of any species of coercive authority. According to the doctrine of the New Testament (2 Timothy ii.), bishops should rather hold themselves aloof from all secular affairs. All believers without dis-

1 Non enim dicta Christi vera sunt causaliter, eo quod eisdem testificetur ecclesia catholica, sed testimonium ecclesiae causaliter verum est propter veritatem dictorum Christi. F. 255.

2 Non omnes eorum actus spirituales sunt, nec dici debent, quinimo ipsorum sunt multi civiles actus contentiosi et carnales seu temporales. Fol. 192.

tinction should own subjection to the civil magistrate, and obey him in all things not standing in conflict with eternal salvation. With what sort of conscience, then, could a priest, of whatever rank or station, presume to absolve subjects from their oath of allegiance binding them to the government that is over them? To do this he pronounces a heresy.[1]

The principles of ecclesiastical law that had prevailed down to this time respecting the method to be pursued with heretics, should, according to the ideas set forth in this work, be altered throughout. To the church should belong no sort of coercive or primitive power. This should belong exclusively to the state, and be applied exclusively to things commanded or forbidden by the laws of the state; as, in fact, immoralities could not be punished by the state, as such, but only so far as they were a violation of the laws of the state. Many things contrary to the laws of God, must needs be tolerated by the state.[2] Civil and divine punishments belong to entirely different provinces. It might happen, that one who ought to be punished according to the laws of the state, would not be found punishable before the divine tribunal.[3] What is a heresy, and what is *not* a heresy, are questions for the priest to decide. He may correct the person found guilty, warn him, and threaten him with eternal punishment; but no other penalties come within his power; just as in all other departments of knowledge,—in the art of healing, in trade, he who understands may decide as to what is right and wrong in his science, but not with the sanction of a penalty. Heresy, however, may be punished by the state; yet only so far as it is in violation of the laws of the state; the state having the power to ordain, that no heretic, no unbeliever shall dwell within its domain. But, if this be permitted to a heretic by the laws of the state, as it has been

1 Fol. 203.

2 Non propterea, quod in legem divinam tantummodo peccat quis, a principante punitur. Sunt enim multa peccata mortalia et in legem divinam, ut fornicationis, quae permittit etiam scienter legislator humanus, nec coactiva potentia prohibet, nec prohibere potest aut debet episcopus vel sacerdos. L. c. f. 248.

3 Peccans in legem humanam peccato aliquo, punietur in alio saeculo non in quantum peccans in legem humanam: multa enim sunt humana lege prohibita, quae sunt divina lege permissa, ut si non restituerit quis mutuum statuto tempore propter impotentiam, casu fortuito, oblivione, aegritudine vel alio quodam impedimento, non punietur ex hoc in alio saeculo per judicem coactivum secundum legem divinam, qui tamen per judicem coactivum secundum legem humanam juste punitur. Ibid.

permitted even among Christian nations, no one has a right to punish him.[1] Just as a man may transgress the rules of some science or trade, and yet will not be punished, on that account, except so far as he transgresses the laws of the state. A man may drink, make shoes, practice the art of healing, as he pleases, or as he can; but he is never punished for this, unless by so doing he transgresses the laws of the state.[2]

Having drawn this strict line of demarcation between the provinces of the state and of the church, the author pronounces that ecclesiastics committing actions punishable according to the civil laws become subject to the coercive power of the state. Inasmuch—says he—as those who are designated by the common name of clergy, may sometimes, by omission or commission, be guilty of sin, and some—would to God they did not sometimes constitute the majority[3]—are actually so guilty to the injury and wrong of others; it follows, that they also fall under the jurisdiction of those judges who have coercive authority, power to punish the transgressors of human laws; and he cites in proof, Romans xiii.[4] In contending against the exemption of the clergy from civil jurisdiction, he says, "nothing spiritual belongs to the crimes of ecclesiastics; they are fleshly actions, and the more fleshly, in the same proportion as it is more difficult and shameful for a priest to sin, since by sinning he gives occasion for sin, and makes it easy to those whom he is bound to restrain from it."[5]

1 Quodsi humana lege prohibitum fuerit, haereticum aut aliter infidelem in regione manere, qui talis in ipsa repertus fuerit, tanquam legis humanae transgressor poena vel supplicio huic transgressioni eadem lege statutis in hoc saeculo debet arceri. Si vero haereticum aut aliter infidelem commorari fidelibus eadem provincia non fuerit prohibitum humana lege, quemadmodum haereticis ac semini Judaeorum jam humanis legibus permissum exstitit, etiam temporibus Christianorum populorum, principium atque pontificum, dico cuipiam non licere haereticum aut aliter infidelem quemquam judicare vel arcere poena vel supplicio reali aut personali pro statu vitae praesentis. Fol. 217.

2 Causa ejus generalis est, quoniam nemo quantumcunque peccans contra disciplinas speculativas aut operativas quascumque punitur vel arcetur in hoc saeculo praecise in quantum hujusmodi, sed in quantum peccat contra praeceptum humanae legis. Sed enim inebriari aut calceos facere vel vendere cujuscunque modi, prout possit aut velit quilibet, medicari et docere ac similia reliqua officiorum opera exercere pro libito si prohibitum non esset humano lege, nequaquam arceretur ebriosus aut aliter perverse agens in operibus reliquis. Ibid.

3 Et agant ipsorum aliqui, utinam non plurimi quandoque de facto.

4 Fol. 211.

5 Eo etiam carnaliores atque temporaliores judicandae magis, quanto secundum

So, again, he distinguishes between what God does by himself and that which he does through the instrumentality of the priest. Adopting the view held by Peter Lombard, he asserts, that it is God alone who bestows forgiveness of sins where its conditions are present in true penitence, and God alone who can purify the soul from the stains of sin. He distinguishes from this the declaration of the priest, which has reference to a man's relation to the outward church. To the priest also it belongs to change a greater punishment which is really due into some minor one voluntarily undertaken.[1] Accordingly he declares strongly against the power arrogated by the pope of absolving men from their obligation to observe the laws of God, with allusion to the pope's conduct towards the emperor Louis. He accuses the pope of heresy in his proceedings towards that emperor.[2] The pope, says he, excites his own subjects to rebel against that Catholic prince by certain devilish writings and discourses, which he calls, however, apostolical, pronouncing them absolved from the oath of allegiance, by which, in good truth, they were and still are bound to that prince. Such absolutions he proclaims through certain ministers of his wickedness, who are hoping to be promoted by that bishop to ecclesiastical offices and benefices. It is plain that this is not an apostolical, but a devilish transaction; for it thus comes about, that this bishop and his companions in wickedness, blinded by avarice, pride and ambition, and full of all malice, as any one may perceive, so lead all that follow them, as that they fall into mortal sin.[3] They are betrayed by this most holy father and his servants, hurried into treason, robbery, murder, and every species of crime; and unless they die in penitence, and find mercy with God on account of their gross ignorance, must be plunged into everlasting destruction. For

ipsa presbyter aut episcopus gravius et turpius peccat, his, quos a talibus revocare debet, delinquendi praebens occasionem et facilitatem sui exemplo perverso. Fol. 242.

1 Fol. 206 sq.

2 Fol. 283: Novum genus exercet nequitiae, quod manifeste videtur haereticam sapore labem.

3 Fol. 284: Secundum hoc et ex hoc episcopus iste cum omnibus sibi complicibus ordinatoribus, consensoribus et executoribus sermone, scriptura vel opere cocci existentes cupiditate, avaritia, superbia cum ambitione summaque, ut omnibus constat, iniquitate repleti, ducatum praebent sibi credentibus et assequentibus ad casum et praecipitationem in foveam mortalium peccatorum.

to every creature endowed with reason it must be certain, that neither the Roman bishop nor any other priest has power to absolve any man whatever from such, or from any other lawful oath, without reasonable cause. He pronounces it an abominable transaction, that the pope, through certain false brethren who were agape for church dignities, should direct the preaching of a crusade against the subjects of the emperor, as a thing well pleasing to God.[1] He pronounces the forgiveness of sins promised by the pope[2] (indulgences) a delusive thing; for, according to the Catholic faith, it could be doubtful to no one, that to those who took part in such a war, this ridiculous and groundless absolution could be of no use, but must rather prove an injury.[3] Yet, for the gratification of his ungodly desires, he so deceives the simple,—granting them in words, what lies beyond his power, thus betraying souls to everlasting perdition.

The author of this work perceived already the baseless, unsubstantial character of the whole hierarchical system; and with a boldness and freedom from all bias, truly worthy of admiration, showed his ability to distinguish the original truth from later impositions. He discovered already, that originally there was but one priestly office, and no distinction of the office of bishops from that of presbyters.[4] "How is it," says he, "that some unscrupulous flatterers dare affirm that every bishop has received from Christ a plenitude of power even over his own clergy, to say nothing of the laity; while neither Peter nor any other apostle ever presumed, by word or deed, to arrogate to themselves any such authority? They who affirm this should be laughed at. They should not be believed; still less should they be

1 Et quod horret auditus, id praedicat, et per quosdam et falsos fratres sitientes ecclesiasticas dignitates tanquam Deo sit acceptum, quemadmodum in transmarinis partibus expugnare paganos, praedicari facit ubique. Fol. 285.

2 Promised even to those who were unable from bodily weakness to take part themselves in the expedition, but yet aided it by their pecuniary contributions; as the words stand: non potentibus propter corporis debilitatem id scelus explere, si ad proprios ipsorum sumtus id per alios usque in idem tempus procuraverint perpetrari, aut summam illam ad hoc sufficientem exhibuerint nefariis exactoribus suis. Ibid.

3 Hanc derisibilem et inanem absolutionem nihil proficere, sed nocere. Fol. 286.

4 We have an illustration of his free spirit of inquiry in his method of proving this from Acts xx. Fol. 239: Ecce quod in ecclesia unius municipii pluros allocutus est apostolus tanquam episcopus, quod non fuit nisi propter sacerdotum pluralitatem, qui omnes episcopi dicebantur, propter hoc, quod superintendentes esse debebant populo.

feared; for the holy Scriptures, in their literal and manifest sense, tell us quite the contrary."[1] So, too, he utterly denies the precedence of rank ascribed to Peter over the rest of the apostles; and he understands very well how to prove, from the New Testament, the groundlessness of this assumption.[2] But even supposing that a certain authority may have been conceded to Peter by the other apostles, yet it would by no means follow from it, he remarks, that this authority was transmitted to the Roman Church; for there is no reason why the same thing might not be said, just as well, of the Church at Jerusalem or at Antioch, or of any other church. It was true of the Apostles, generally, that to no one of them was a distinct and separate church assigned; but they were commissioned to preach the Gospel to all people.[3] It could not be proved from the law of God, nor by any Scripture which it is necessary to salvation to believe, that it was ever determined by Christ, or by an apostle, or by the collective body of the apostles, that a bishop of some one particular province should be called particularly the successor of Peter or of any other apostle, or that he should be accounted more than the others, however unequal the apostles may have been among themselves; but *he* rather was, in a certain sense, successor of Peter and of the rest of the apostles, who came nearest to them in copying their lives and their holy manners;[4] according to the saying of Christ, that they were his mother, his brothers, and his sisters, who did the will of his Father in heaven, Matthew xii. The bishop of Rome ought rather to be called successor of the Apostle Paul, who for two years preached the Gospel at Rome, than the successor of Peter. It could not even be shown from the New Testament, that Peter had ever been at Rome.[5]

1 Fol. 243: Cur ergo et unde assumunt adulatores sacrilegi quidam dicere, quemquam episcopum habere a Christo plenitudinem potestatis, etiam in clericos, nedum in laicos, cum beatus Petrus aut alter apostolus nunquam talem sibi potestatem adscribere praesumserit opere vel sermone? Hoc enim asserentes deridendi sunt, nihil credendi minusque timendi, cum scripturae oppositum clament in literali et manifesto sensu ipsarum.

2 Fol. 241, et sq.

3 Quia nullus apostolorum lege divina determinatus fuit omnino ad populum aliquem vel locum. Fol. 244.

4 Sed ille vel illi magis sunt aliquo modo beati Petri et reliquorum apostolorum successores, qui vitae et ipsorum sanctis moribus amplius conformantur. Fol. 245.

5 Dico per scripturam sacram convinci non posse, ipsum fuisse Romanum episcopum, et quod amplius est, ipsum unquam Romae fuisse. Fol. 245.

The free, inquiring spirit, and the sharp discernment of this man, are evidenced in the skill with which he shows up the idle character of those tales, so long time believed, about the labours of Peter in Rome, and his there meeting with Paul. It must certainly be regarded, he says, as very singular and surprising that Luke, the author of the Acts of the Apostles, and Paul, should no where make mention of Peter. How can this fact be reconciled with the statement, that Peter had laboured in Rome before Paul, when it appears from the last chapter of the Acts, that to the Jews in Rome the Christians were a wholly unknown sect? How can this supposition be reconciled with the fact that, when Paul reproached the Jews for their unbelief, he did not appeal to the earlier preaching of Peter; that Paul, during his two years' residence in Rome, should never come in contact with Peter; or that the history of the apostles should have taken no notice of the fact?[1] He asserts the original equality of all bishops, and their independence of each other, and traces the origin of a certain primacy of the Roman church to the times of the emperor Constantine.[2] Though he did not look upon the primacy of the Roman church as anything originally inherent in that church, yet he supposes that such a primacy sprang gradually, of its own accord, out of existing relations. The high consideration in which the great capital of the world universally stood, and the eminently flourishing condition of the sciences at that centre of learning, were the occasions that led men to seek counsel and advice especially from that church, and to look to that quarter for their clergy. As an example, he compares the relation of the University of Orleans to that of Paris. He him-

1 Admirandissimum dico, quod b. Lucas, qui actus apostolorum scripsit, et Paulus apostolus de beato Petro nullam prorsus mentionem fecerunt. Then, after a quotation from Acts xxviii. 19—23: Dicat ergo mihi veritatis inquisitor, non quaerens contendere solum, si probabile sit alicui, beatum Petrum Romam praevenisse Paulum et nihil nuntiasse de Christi fide, quam Judaei loquentes ad Paulum sectam vocabant? Amplius Paulus in reprehendendo ipsos de incredulitate, si novisset Cepham ibidem fuisse et praedicasse, quomodo non dixisset aut ipsum hujus testem induxisset negotii, qui resurrectionis Christi testis exstiterat. Quis opinabitur, quod biennio existens ibidem Paulus nunquam conversationem, collationem aut contubernium habuerit cum b. Petro? Et si habuisset, quod de ipso nullam penitus mentionem fecessit, qui actuum scripsit historiam?

2 Qui quandam praeeminentiam et potestatem tribuit episcopis et ecclesiae Romanorum super caeteras mundi ecclesias seu presbyteros omnes. Fol. 213.

self had been witness how the University of Paris had been consulted for advice by the former.[1] He held to a certain priority of one church, which, however, was not connected with any right of jurisdiction over the others; and to this priority, not indeed as anything necessary, or founded on divine right, but yet as a thing salutary and conducive to the preservation of church unity.[2] Did any one ask, to what bishop should such a place of eminence be conceded? It ought, in good truth, to be said, to the one who excelled all the others in life and doctrine; and the chief stress here was to be laid on the life. Did any one ask, to what ecclesiastical diocese should such a distinction be conceded? that one should be designated, in which were to be found a clerical body most distinguished for life and doctrine. Yet, provided only the other requisites were present, it was very proper that such consideration might still continue to be conceded, according to ancient custom, to the church of Rome. But Marsilius takes strong ground against the authority ascribed to the pope and the cardinals to decide anything about matters of faith. "How in case," says he, "that a heretic should be elevated to the papal dignity; or that one after having attained to that dignity, should from ignorance or from wickedness fall into some heresy; ought the heretical decisions of such a pope to pass for valid?" He adduces, for example, the decision contrary to the gospel given by Pope John XXII., on the matter of evangelical poverty; a decision which he put forth to the end that he might not appear to have fallen from Christian perfection, and that he might assert his secular dominion.[3] He appeals again to the bull Unam sanctam issued by Pope Boniface VIII., which he calls a thing false to the very core.[4]

1 Sic et qui librum hunc in lucem deduxit, studiosorum universitatem Aurelianis degentem vidit, audivit et scivit per suos nuntios et epistolas requirentem et supplicantem Pariensi universitati tanquam famosiori et veneratiori caet. Fol. 252.

2 Quamvis non sit lege divina praeceptum, quoniam et sine hoc fidei unitas, licet non sic faciliter salvaretur, expedire dico ad hanc unitatem facilius et docentius observandam. Fol. 265.

3 Ne summam Christi paupertatem et perfectionis statum deserere videretur, cum hoc volens temporalia etiam immobilia in suo venditandi retinere dominio et seculariter principari. Fol. 257.

4 Nunc autem eam ab initio nunc et semper constat esse falsam, erroneam cunctisque civiliter viventibus praejudicialissimam omnium excogitabilium falsorum. Ibid.

The supreme authority to determine in all disputed matters pertaining to faith he ascribes to a general council, assembled with the consent and participation of all the faithful; and to such a council he thinks the guidance of the Holy Spirit may have been promised.[1] He considered it desirable, especially in the then existing condition of the clergy, that laymen should also be allowed a seat in the councils. "In the present corrupt state of the church," says he, "the great majority of the priests and bishops are but little, and if we may speak freely, quite insufficiently experienced in the sacred Scriptures; because they hanker after the benefices, to which ambitious, covetous aspirants, skilled in canonical law, attain, by services rendered, by petition, by money or the aid of the secular power.[2] I call God and the multitude of believers to witness," says he, "that I have seen and heard of very many priests and abbots and some prelates, incapable even of preaching a sermon according to the rules of grammar." He mentions it as a fact, that he had known a young man not twenty years old, absolutely ignorant of the doctrines of religion, to whom the office of a bishop, in a respectable and populous city, had been granted, though he had not as yet passed through the inferior grades of clerical consecration. And this thing, the pope, who as vicar of Christ, pretended to possess the "plenitude of power" in the distribution of benefices, had often done, with a view to secure the favour of the powerful. Now for what purpose should a parcel of such bishops and priests assemble together? How should such persons be able to distinguish between the true and the false sense of the Scriptures? Owing, then, to the deficiencies of such persons, it was necessary to call in the assistance of discreet laymen, sufficiently versed in the sacred Scriptures, men distinguished also by their lives and manners above such bishops and priests.[3] He describes in general the great mischief that grew out of the arbitrary power conceded to the popes in making appointments to ecclesi-

1 Fol. 253.

2 Nunc vero propter ecclesiastici regiminis corruptionem plurima pars sacerdotum et episcoporum in sacra scriptura periti sunt parum, et si dicere liceat insufficienter, eo quod temporalia beneficiorum, quae assequuntur officiosis ambitiosi, cupidi et causidici quidam, obtinere volunt et obtinent obsequio, prece vel pretio vel saeculari potentia. Fol. 258.

3 Fol 258.

astical offices. Supposing the Roman bishop to be a proud man, sunk also in other vices, a man disposed to exercise secular powers such as several had been known to be in modern times; a person of this character, to gratify his insatiable avarice, or his other passions, to gain the favour of the powerful, would put up ecclesiastical offices for sale; and to please the same class, would confer such offices on their relatives and friends. And that this not only might be done, but had actually long been done and was still done, was a fact testified by an experience not hidden from any of the faithful.[1] He speaks as an eye witness himself of the corruption of the Roman court. "They," says he, "who have trod the threshold of the Roman court, or to speak more strictly according to truth, that house of traffic, that abominable den of robbers, will have seen, and they who have not themselves visited it, will have heard from the reports of numerous credible eye witnesses, that it is the resort of all the vicious crew who push a trade with spiritual as they would with secular things.[2] For what else do you find there, but a confluence from all quarters of those who exercise the trade of simony? What else than the bustling of attorneys, the intrigues of cabal-lers, and persecutions of righteous men? There the just cause of the innocent runs an awful hazard of being defeated; or if they cannot redeem it with money, of being so long retarded, that, exhausted, wearied out by countless vexations, they are finally compelled to abandon their just and pitiable cause; for these *human* laws are loud and noisy, while *divine* doctrines are silent, or let themselves be heard but seldom. There it is deliberated how the countries of Christian men may be forcibly wrested from the hands of those to whom the guardianship of them has been lawfully committed. There no pains are taken, no counsels held to win souls to Christ; there no order, but only everlasting confusion dwells. I who have been there and have seen it,[3] fancied to myself that I beheld the frightful image which

1 Fol. 262.

2 Cernent se ipsis limpide, qui Romanae curiae, imo verius cum veritate dicam, domus negotiationis, et ea quae latronum horribilioris speluncae limina visitarunt, aut qui ab hac abstinuerunt, numerosae fide dignorum multitudinis relatione discent, eam paene sceleratorum omnium et negotiatorum tam spiritualium quam temporalium receptaculum esse factam. Fol. 274.

3 Qui vidi et affui. Fol. 274.

Nebuchadnezzar saw in his dream (Daniel ii.); for what else is this great image than the condition of the Roman court, which once was fearful to the perverse and wicked, but is now, to all who study it near at hand, awful to contemplate?[1] The upper part of the image, to which the eyes and the affections of the mind are attracted, gold and silver; the belly and hips, the bustle of worldly strife and the trade of simony; not to mention the thunder of the ban against the faithful of Christ, who, in secular things, refuse to submit to the pope and his church, and refuse, though rightly, to commit temporal things to him. What are the thighs of brass but the sumptuous apparatus for all pleasures and all vanities, which even to laymen, seem indecent, but which those persons parade forth to the senses of men who ought to present to all others an example of purity and honour?[2] He complains that the popes supposed people of the lowest order, altogether without experience, wealth or secular dominion, capable if they attained suddenly and at once to so great wealth and power, of holding rule over princes and nations.[3] He points at the popes as the destroyers of the church. "The modern popes," says he, "do not defend the Catholic faith and the multitude of believers, who are in the true sense the bride of Christ, but prostrate them to the ground: they do not preserve her beauty, which consists in unity, but they disgrace it, by sowing tares and contentions: they sever her members, and separate them one from another; and allowing no place to the poverty and humility that truly belong to the following after Christ, but rather banishing it from their presence, they prove themselves to be not servants, but enemies of the bridegroom."[4]

1 Quid nempe aliud ingens haec statua, quam status personarum curiae Romanae seu summi pontificis, qui olim perversis hominum terribilis, nunc vero cunctis studiosis horribilis est aspectu. Ib.

2 Voluptatum, luxus et vanitatum quasi omnium, etiam laicis indecentium, apparatus pomposus, quem sensibus hominum imprimunt, qui caeteris esse debent castitatis et honestatis exemplum. Fol. 274.

3 Eorum plurimi ex humili plebe trahentes natalia, dum ad statum pontificalem sumuntur, praesidatum sacculi nescientes, quemadmodum neque divitias, indiscreti nuper ditati, fidelibus omnibus importabiles fiunt. Fol. 279.

4 Sic igitur propter temporalia contendendo non vere defenditur sponsa Christi. Eam etenim, quae vere Christi sponsa est, catholicam fidem et fidelium multitudinem, non defendunt moderni Romanorum pontifices, sed offendunt, illiusque pulchritudinem, unitatem videlicet, non servant, sed foedant, dum zizanias et schismata seminando, ipsius membra lacerant et ab invicem separant, Christi quoque veras comites, paupertatem et humilitatem, dum non admittunt, sed excludunt penitus, se sponsi ministros non ostendunt, sed potius inimicos. Fol. 281.

The author of this remarkable book must assuredly have atoned with his life for such freedom of thought, if the contest between the pope and the emperor had not secured his safety in spite of the sentence of condemnation passed upon him by the former. It is true, the principles expressed in his book met as yet with no response; but it was still an important sign of the times, that such principles were expressed.

As the pope did not comply with the invitation from Rome to return back to that place, the Ghibelline party triumphed there, and the emperor was received with acclamation. In connection with the party opposed to the pope, the rigid Franciscans in particular, he repeated the old trick which had been tried against the popes, by earlier emperors, but which never was found to produce the slightest moral effect. He caused a solemn assembly to be held in the year 1328, on the place in front of St Peter's church. Here John XXII. was accused of being a heretic. The erroneous doctrines charged against him were the assertion that Christ with his disciples held property in common, when in truth he ever loved poverty; that the pope was for arrogating to himself secular rule, contrary to Christ's words, "Give to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," and "My kingdom is not of this world." Sentence of deposition was pronounced against him. A contemporary[1] who entertained a sufficiently bad opinion of this pope, describes the impression produced by this step, and probably according to the truth, when he says, "The wise men in Rome were much disturbed at this sentence, and the rest of the simple people did not greatly exult over it."[2] Next, to win the favour of the Romans, a law was enacted,[3] that every pope should reside in Rome, and not leave the city, except during three months in the year; and not remain out of it more than two days, and for that time only with the permission of the Roman people.

1 The Florentine Giovanni Villani, in his History of Florence. This writer, l. 11, c. 20, speaks of his extortions and his avarice, says that he used a great deal of money, partly to carry on his war with the emperor in Lombardy, partly to maintain his nephew, or rather son, in state and splendour,—mantanero grande il suo nipote, overo figliuolo,—who was legate at Lombardy. The good man did not call to mind that Christ in the gospel says to his disciples, Your treasure is in heaven, and Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth. Ma non si ricordava il buono huomo del vangelo di Christo, dicendo a suoi discipoli, etc.

2 Della detta sentenzia i savi huomini di Roma molto si turbarono, e l'altro semplice popolo ne fece grande festa. L. 10. c. 68.

3 L. c. c. 70.

If, on absenting himself from Rome, he did not, when invited by the Roman people to return, comply, he should, after the invitation had been thrice repeated, be deposed. After this preparatory step, the emperor[1] caused a second great assembly to be held on Ascension Day, the 12th of May 1328, in the place before St Peter's church. Louis appeared in all his imperial insignia, surrounded by nobles, and a vast multitude of men and women filled the space around him. Then Pietro Corvaro, a Franciscan, who by his strict life had won the reverence of the people, was borne in procession under a baldochin. The emperor rose from his seat. A bishop stepped forward and delivered a scurrilous discourse, applying the words in Acts xii. 8 to the emperor Louis, comparing Louis with the angel, and pope John with Herod. Next, a bishop selected for the purpose, thrice put the question to the assembled people whether they would have Peter of Corvaro for pope. Prompted by fear, they said yes; though they would have preferred a Roman. . . Corvaro was now regarded as lawful pope, and called himself, as such, Nicholas V. This certainly was a hasty and ill-judged transaction, by which the emperor could only injure his own cause.[2] He was in no condition to follow up the step he had taken. He was obliged to flee from Italy; and Nicholas was finally compelled to beg absolution of Pope John at Avignon, and to submit to his authority. Louis saw that his power was on the wane. The papal ban had made an impression on the secular and spiritual estates; and his own unfavourable relations induced the emperor, who longed for quiet, to seek reconciliation with the pope; but the latter repelled all his advances, and required unconditional submission. Already was Louis prepared to purchase quiet at any price for himself and for Germany; but the estates of the empire were unwilling to expose the empire to such humiliation, and took sides with the emperor against the pope. The latter had by his arbitrary proceedings in appointments to church offices, aroused the displeasure of many. The archbishop of Trier, indignant at a process

[1] L. c. c. 71.

[2] Villani describes the bad impression which was made thereby on the minds of the Romans. La buona gente di Roma molto si turbu, parendo loro, che facesse contro a fede e santa Chiesa, e sapemo noi di vero dalla sua gente medesima, che quelli, ch'erano savi, parve loro ch'egli non facesse bene, e molti per la detta cagione mai non li furono fedeli come prima. Ibid.

lost at the Roman court in Avignon, had appealed to a general council. In addition to this Pope John had stirred up a theological controversy, by which he lost much of his authority, and exposed himself to severe humiliation. He had expressed an opinion, contrary to the common persuasion, and hardly to be reconciled with the prevailing mode of regarding the condition of the saints, namely that the pious were not to attain to the intuition of God, until after the final judgment. Two preachers of the Franciscan order were said to have embraced this doctrine at the University of Paris. It became the occasion of disputes and violent commotions in that University. The king interfered. He convoked, on the fourth Sunday of Advent, 1333, an assembly of prelates and theologians at the castle of Vincennes, and laid before this council two questions; whether the holy souls in heaven would be enabled to behold God's essence before the resurrection and before the general judgment; and whether the same intuition of the divine essence, which they now enjoyed, would be renewed at the day of judgment, or a different one would follow.[1] The king himself explained, for the purpose of quieting all apprehension, that he was far from wishing to detract in any way whatever from the honour of the pope. To save the honour and respect due to the pope in this investigation, it was remarked, that the supreme pontiff had thrown out all that he had said on this matter, not as his own opinion, but as something problematical.[2] As the result of these deliberations it was established, that the souls which, on departing this life, were in such a condition as not to need purgation, and those which had already passed through the fires of purgatory, were raised to the immediate intuition of the divine essence; this was one and the same thing with the eternal life itself, and at the resurrection therefore, nothing different would follow. What the theological faculty here pronounced orally, they were afterwards required by the king to state in writing. He transmitted this letter to the pope, admonishing him to recant, and threatening him, as it is reported, in case of refusal, with the faggot.[3] John thus

1 Bulaei hist. Univ. Paris, tom. iv. f. 237.

2 The Parisians say, in excuse of themselves: Quod multorum fide dignorum relatione audivimus, quod quidquid in hac materia sanctitas sua dixit, non asserendo seu opinando protulerit, sed solummodo recitando.

3 According to the statement of D'Ailly, at the Council of Paris, in the year 1406. Du Boulay, l. c. s. 238.

became still more dependant on the king; to whom henceforth, as Villani relates, he no longer dared refuse anything. Shortly before his death, in the year 1334, he put forth a bull, in which he declared, that purified departed souls found themselves in heaven or in paradise. In all he had said or written to the contrary, he had only intended to present the matter as a fair subject for disputation. All that he had said and written should be considered valid only so far as it harmonized with the catholic faith, the church and the holy Scriptures. He submitted everything to the better judgment of the church and of his successors. We thus observe from the reign of Boniface VIII. and onwards to this point of time, a series of new and freer investigations called forth by the despotism of the popes. After Marsilius of Padua, deserves to be especially noticed here William Occam, who by the invitation of the emperor wrote upon the points in dispute.[1] In perfect agreement with his whole sceptical method he is cautious indeed about expressing any decided opinion, and takes a safe position for himself by simply stating the arguments first on the one side and then on the other.[2] But at the same time, he leaves us at no loss to understand for which opinion he is both able and willing to adduce the strongest arguments.

Against the opinion that the pope possesses the "plenitude of power" *tam in spiritualibus quam in temporalibus*, it is established that in such case the gospel in its relation to the law of Moses would not be a law of liberty, but the law of an intolerable servitude; a servitude still more grievous than under the earlier dis-

1 As he says himself, in the Octo Questiones, near to the end, Goldasti mon. tom. ii., fol. 391: Illum autem dominum mihi quam plurimum venerandum, qui hoc opus componere suis precibus me induxit, rogo et obsecro, ut mihi indulgeat, si praescriptas quaestiones ad intentionem suam sim minime prosecutus, quare eas discutiendas voluit et mihi tradidit et porrexit.

2 As he says himself in the beginning, f. 314: Quia sequens opusculum, ut desidero, ad manus forte perveniet aemulorum, qui odio stimulante etiam quae ipsis vera videntur (si dicerem) damnare, vel ad periculosum sensum trahere molirentur, tali modo in eo conabor procedere, ut ex modo loquendi non quis dicit, sed quid dicitur coacti attendere, mei ob odium, nisi ipsos malitia vexaverit, inauditam nequaquam nequitor lanient veritatem: personam enim biviam recitabo et saepius opiniones contrarias pertractabo, non solum eas, quibus adversor, sed etiam quibus mente adhaereo, hoc tamen nullatenus exprimendo, interdum scienter pro eis tentative sive sophistice allegando in persona confirmatium aliorum, ut pro utraque parte allegationibus intellectis veritatis sincerus amator purae orationis verum a falso habeat discernendi occasionem.

pensation. For, according to this view, all would be servants of the pope, so that he might, at pleasure, appoint kings and dispose of their realms; so that he might even impose rites and ceremonies upon the church like those in the Old Testament; a position which to many appeared heretical. When the Jews accused Christ of calling himself king, Pilate declared, that he found no fault in him, since he well understood that Christ did not mean to call himself a king in temporal things, but in quite another sense, not seeming to him to stand in any contradiction with the authority of Cæsar. It was only his fear of the threat of the Jews, to accuse him before Cæsar, that induced him, against his better convictions, to consent to pass sentence upon Christ. Hence many wonder, how it should be that a man of the world, like the heathen Pilate, should gather this from Christ's words, whilst many christians who would be regarded even as teachers of the law, do not understand it. There seems to be no other reason for it, but that they are blinded by wrong inclinations.

With regard to the power to bind and to loose bestowed on Peter, the opinion of certain persons is cited, who held that this relates only to sins; and even in this relation, only to the power of bestowing the sacrament of penance; not that he was to have power to expunge guilt, or impart grace, for this lies within the power of God alone; but only to declare men discharged in the view of the church, and to impose on them some act of satisfaction in this world; not to exercise any coercive jurisdiction. It is clearly seen and affirmed, that although under the Old Testament economy the priestly power was placed above the royal, yet this was not the case, under the New Testament; because under this, a spiritual authority only is bestowed on the clergy.[1] We perceive already, in this distinguishing of the difference between Old and New Testament points of view, the preparatory step to a position which would involve the overthrow of the churchly theocratical system of the middle ages. Could we, it is said, be justified in applying all the Old Testament relations to the New

1 Fol. 327: Esto, quod in veteri lege pontificalis auctoritas praelata fuisset etiam in temporalibus dignitati regali, non tamen esset praeferenda in nova lege: quia auctoritas pontificalis in nova lege spiritualior est et magis a terrenis negotiis elongatu, quam fuerit auctoritas pontificalis in veteri lege, quemadmodum lex nova magis est spiritualis, quam lex vetus.

Testament evolution, we should in that case be led to the heretical doctrine of the permanent validity of the Mosaic law.[1] All that the pope holds in possession beyond what is necessary for his temporal support, all that belongs to the worldly pomp and magnificence with which he is at present environed,[2] he either obtained from the liberality of emperors, kings and other believers, or has tyrannically arrogated to himself in a way contrary to God's will, to reason and to good manners. In relation, therefore, to that which he lawfully possessed, he was not successor of Peter, but of Constantine and other emperors, of kings and other believers, who bestowed these things on the pope; but in no such way as conferred on him an unlimited right of property in all this; for he was obligated, on peril of his salvation, to administer all that had been bestowed over and above what was necessary for his own support, according to the will and purpose of the donors. And if he administered it otherwise, he was guilty of a breach of trust, and was bound to make restitution.[3] The sentences passed by the pope on the emperor Louis were represented as null and void, because the pope was to be regarded as a heretic; and here it is remarked, "When the power or will of the pope becomes matter of debate, christians in these days take no trouble to ascertain for themselves what Christ taught, or what the apostles or the fathers have thought on this subject, though it be ever so plain and manifest. But whatever may happen to please the pope, that they adopt, prompted by fear, or favour, or fleshly desires; and try to wrest those passages of Scripture which assert the contrary into some agreement with the fables which they have dreamed.[4] They transfer to the pope the

1 Respondetur, quod ista allegatio haereticalis est, quia sequitur ex ipsa, quod circumcisionem, discretionem ciborum et alia caerimonalia et judicialia veteris legis deberet etiam imitari. Ibid.

2 Omnia, quae ultra illa, quae sibi necessaria sunt, possidet, sc. civitates, castra, amplas possessiones et superabundantes, et jurisdictionem temporalem quamcunque, sicut et omnem gloriam mundanam, qua papa nunc rutilat.

3 Fol. 385.

4 Ubi de potestate vel etiam de voluntate papae fit sermo, non curant Christiani scire his diebus, quid Christus docuit, nec quod apostoli senserunt et sancti patres, quamvis ratione manifesta hoc doceretur; sed quod placet papae, timore vel amore aut cupiditate carnis amplectuntur, et ad fabulas, quas somniaverunt, scripturas et prophetias student trahere repugnantes, et sic ad Papam transferre videntur honorificentiam creatoris. Fol. 390.

honour which is due to God alone; and, in contradiction with the Apostle Paul, make christian faith to consist in the wisdom, or rather in the will of the pope, not in that which holy Scripture teacheth."[1] Then it was shown that the excuses commonly offered with a view to exculpate the pope from the charge of heresy were of no force. The pope was said to have held forth dogmas, declared to be heretical, only historically or in the way of disputation. On the contrary, it was maintained, that were the matter rightly inquired into, it might be clearly established, that he had beyond all doubt set these things forth as positive assertions. Neither could he be exculpated on the ground that he had at the end of his life recanted whatever he had wrongly asserted; for this recantation was a conditional one, such as any heretic, however obstinate, might offer. And even supposing this might suffice to excuse him, then he should still be regarded as having been a heretic in the time preceding this recantation.[2] The maxim of Augustine, "Ego vero evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas," is in his Dialogue[3] thus explained: By the ecclesia we are here to understand the collective multitude of all the faithful from the times of the prophets and apostles down to the present; to which collective body belongs also the founder of the gospel dispensation; and the part is greater than the whole.[4] In the second book, the proofs are arrayed in defence of the position that no doctrine incapable of being proved from holy Scripture, was to be acknowledged as catholic and necessary to salvation; neither the church nor the pope could make new articles of faith.

The pope who came after John XXII., Benedict XII., is said to have been a quite different man from his predecessor. He was decidedly opposed to nepotism. His relatives could get nothing from him. He took great pains to fill the vacant sees with pious and able men; he preferred rather to let vacancies

1 Fidem Christianam contra apostolum in sapientia vel potius voluntate papae, non voluntate scripturae ponentes. Ibid.

2 Fol. 390.

3 Between Scholar and Teacher.

4 Non quia de evangelio sit aliqualiter dubitandum, sed quia totum majus est sua parte. Ecclesia ergo, quae majoris auctoritatis est, quam evangelista, est illa ecclesia, cujus auctor evangelii pars esse agnoscitur. Lib. 1. c. 4, Goldast. l. 1, fol. 402.

remain for a long time unoccupied, than to fill them with worthless incumbents. He was a rigid censor of the degenerate clergy and monks: he sought in particular to reform the monastic orders. But there are also other reports about him, differing widely from all this. He is described as a harsh, covetous man, given to immoderate drinking, the author of the saying: Bibamus papaliter. Yet it may be questioned, whether the severity of this pope as a reformer so detrimental to the interests of many may not have been the occasion of reports so injurious to his reputation.[1] The emperor Louis offered his hand again to this pope, for peace; and the latter would gladly have accepted it; but he found it impossible to break loose from his dependance on the French interest.

Benedict again was succeeded, in the year 1343, by a man of quite opposite character; a Frenchman, of an altogether worldly temper, devoid of all interest in religion, having a bad reputation as to his morals, more devoted to worldly politics than to the affairs of religion, and in his politics wholly dependant on the French court. This was Clement VI.[2] To the Romans he gave an indemnification for what they had lost by the long absence of the popes, by reducing to fifty years the centennial jubilee which had proved a source of so much profit to them under Boniface VIII. This was done by the famous constitution Unigenitus, which he published in the year 1349.[3] The pope assigned as a reason for it the sacredness of the number fifty according to the Old Testament, a number according to

1 Thus John of Winterthur puts both together, fol. 39, describing him as a reformer of monachism and potator vini permaximus. The same thing appears in the 8 vita in Baluz pap. Aven. t. i. Paris, 1693, f. 240, where we plainly see that it was just the severity of the pope as a reformer which provoked and occasioned the accusations laid against him. The censures are such as might possibly have been called forth by qualities which really deserved praise. Hic papa avarus, durus et tenax, in conferendis gratiis remissus, tardus et negligens in providendo statum ecclesiarum supra modum fuit, et in excusatione duritiae suæ paucos ad haec dignos et sufficientes dicebat. Omnes dominos cardinales fore deceptores sui credebat. Ordines mendicantium supra modum exosos habebat.—Huic maxime insitum cordi fuit, clericos et religiosorum ordinum professores et status reformare et, ut dicatur verius, infirmare. The same writer also cites the by-word which proceeded from him.

2 In the Chronicle of Albert of Strasburg, it is said of him: Hic ab antecessoris sui moribus multum distans, mulierum, honorum et potentiae cupidus, curiam de simonia diffamans, ipse Francus Franco ferventer adhaesit. Urctis. German. historic. post Henric. IV. pars alt. Francof. 1585, fol. 133.

3 Printed in Raynaldi, Annales, at the year 1349. § 11.

which also followed the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. The doctrine of indulgence was here expounded conformably to the determinations already given to it, that Christ had gained for his church a treasure, and had committed it to her keeping, and more particularly to the successors of the Apostle Peter, to whom he had entrusted the guidance of the church. To this had been added the merits of Mary and of all the elect. There was no fear that such a treasure could ever be diminished; because the merits of Christ were infinite, and because the greater the number who should be incited by the appropriation of this treasure to strive after righteousness, the more would be added to it. The emperor Louis renewed his negotiations with this pope, and he was ready to do anything that might be required of him to purchase peace. But the pope, who cared nothing for the distracted condition of the German people, who looked at nothing but his own worldly interests, to which everything else was sacrificed, contrived purposely to have the matter put off without coming to any agreement; for the imperial dignity was to be transferred to another person, related to the royal family of France, and educated to principles of dependance on the papacy. This was Prince Charles of Bohemia, afterwards the emperor Charles IV. In Germany, the pope's measures called forth violent reactions in favour of freedom, movements of the city communities devoted to the emperor, who were unwilling to have an emperor imposed upon them by the arbitrary will of the pope —against those ecclesiastics and monks, who strictly observed the papal interdict. Thus, for example, the clergy of Constance were twice banished, because they refused to hold divine service.[1] Many monks in different districts of Germany were for the same reason driven away, and the people shouted after them as they left, that it would be a long time before they came back again. When four years afterwards they showed an inclination to obey the emperor, and to recommence the public worship of God, they still were not permitted to return.

The distractions which grew out of these divisions, added to the devastations occasioned by that desolating scourge, the black plague, had a great influence upon the religious tone of

1 John of Winterthur, at the year 1343, f. 60.

feeling. The more seriously disposed were recalled from the conflict of the passions and the schisms of the world without, were led to enter into the depths of their own being, to collect their thoughts to God and before Him—the inward self-collection of mysticism among a class of monks and laymen who united to form pious communities, calling themselves Friends of God in South Germany, the countries on the Rhine, France, Swabia and Alsace. John of Winterthur laments that the emperor and pope should sacrifice the general weal to their private passions and personal interests;[1] that they should have God and the welfare of the church and state so little before their eyes, and seek only their own. He ascribes all this to the secularization of the church; and taking up the ancient legend already alluded to, he says: On the bestowment of that gift of the emperor Constantine to the Roman bishop Silvester, rightly was the voice heard from heaven, saying, To-day a cup of poison is poured upon the church. In the events of the time he beholds the most striking evidence of the truth of these words. The confounding together of things spiritual and secular, the love of earthly things reigning supreme in the church, appear to him the true source of all the then existing schisms and wars.[2] What the Apostle Paul said of the perils of the last times, seems to him to be already passing into fulfilment.

The emperor ordered fasts and penitential processions, in which he zealously took part himself to implore the Almighty, that by the outpouring of his Holy Spirit, he would bring peace to the church. But the pope, having once made up his mind, that another man should be emperor, prescribed to Louis conditions so severe, that the princes would not consent to an humiliation of the emperor, so derogatory to the honour of the empire. The quarrels about the observance of the interdict still went on in Germany, as well as the schism that grew out of it. Many eccle-

1 Fol. 69.

2 After the citation of those words: Quod hodierna die luce clarius cernimus tam oculis mentis quam carnis, imo experimur malis quotidianis graviter et importabiliter, jacturam et dispendia bonorum, corporum animarum et rerum propter hoc sustinendo. Proprio venenum ecclesiae infusum a voce memorata dicitur, quia illa liberalis datio Constantini fomes et occasio, quamquam bono zelo fecerit, schismatis praelibati, contentionum, preliorum, homocidiorum, scandalorum innumerabilium a capitibus sacerdotum promotorum, pro regnis et terrenis bonis seu possessionibus temporalibus capiendis exstitit.

siastics who were sincerely desirous of holding divine worship again in places that had been laid under the interdict, took advantage of the pope's avarice, and purchased absolution at the price of a florin.[1] John of Winterthur complains bitterly of the corruption of the church in relating this: "O what a deplorable and abominable schism and disgrace has fallen upon the church in these times! The words of the gospel—Freely ye have received, and freely give, seem to have been spoken in vain." This state of things lasted until the emperor's death in the year 1347.

It was now required that homage should be paid throughout Germany to Charles IV. as the emperor acknowledged by the pope. Yet the manner in which it was attempted to carry this out provoked violent opposition of various kinds. The German spirit revolted more and more against the Roman yoke. A more general consciousness was awakened of the corruption of the church, and longing for its purification. The hard conditions which the pope saw fit to require in bestowing absolution on those who had been placed under the ban on account of their connection with the emperor Louis, contributed still more to excite the minds of numbers who still cherished an affectionate remembrance of the unfortunate emperor, and who were disgusted with the yoke of Roman bondage. Men were required to swear, that they would renounce their old errors, consider the emperor Louis as excommunicated, never attribute to an emperor the power of deposing the pope, never acknowledge any man to be emperor, save the one nominated or confirmed by the pope. These demands were in several districts violently resisted, and called forth the most decided reactions of a spirit in favour of freedom. In many places, in Basle for example, it was found necessary to yield to the fierce clamours of the people, and to suspend the interdict without farther ado. Here, too, the clergy had an opportunity presented to them for gratifying their avarice. The consecration of burial places, supposed to have been profaned, might now be converted into a means of gain. From forty to sixty florins were demanded as the price for this service. The consciousness of the corruption of the church now generally awakened, and the temper of the people who earnestly longed

[1] John of Winterthur, at the year 1345, fol. 78: Hujusmodi autem absolutio pro uno floreno facillime obtinebatur.

for its regeneration, expressed themselves in a legend which started up afresh and spread far and wide, importing that the emperor Frederic II. was soon to arise from the dead to execute with his mighty arm a sentence of retributive justice on the corrupt clergy, and to restore the church in renovated splendour. John of Winterthur, who relates the story, compares this expectation with that of the Jews who were looking for the Messiah to restore their place and nation. The ten years' reign of Innocent VI. extending to 1362, passed away in tranquillity. He again was favourably distinguished among the popes of Avignon, for the disposition he manifested to promote the welfare of the church, and to frown on growing abuses. He died in the year 1362, and was succeeded by Urban V. Urban received more and more pressing invitations to come up to the help of the deeply depressed Roman church in Italy. Petrarch, who had always borne emphatic testimony against the corruption of the papal court at Avignon, addressed to this pope[1] a letter, invalidating all the scruples against the re-conveyance of the papacy to Rome, and calling upon him in the strongest language to return to the ancient seat of the pontiffs. He tried to convince the cardinals, men devoted to their pleasures, that in Italy too, a land so highly blessed by nature, nothing would be found wanting; and that they who felt it impossible to give up the wines of Southern France, needed not after all to be much afraid of the exchange. He asked the cardinals, whether they had rather be buried in Avignon among the worst sinners in the world, than in Rome, among saints and martyrs. At length, in the year 1367, Urban made an attempt to return; and he was received in Rome with great demonstrations of joy. But the French cardinals soon pined again after the old seat of their pleasures, and Urban was prevailed upon to yield to their wishes. He repaired once more, in 1370, to Avignon, where he died on the very year of his return. His successor was cardinal Roger, a celebrated Jurist and Canonist, called *Gregory* XI. Before he became pope, he had expressed himself strongly in favour of transporting the papal court back to Rome. Both Catherine of Siena, then held in high veneration as a saint, and Brigitta of Sweden, called upon him

[1] Epp. senil. l. 7, 1. Oper. ed. Basil. p. 811.

in the most urgent manner to accomplish this object. A bishop, whom he reprimanded for living away from his see, retorted upon him, by asking why he did not do better then himself. In the year 1376, he returned back with a part of the cardinals to Rome. He shortly after died in the year 1378.

We might predict beforehand that the death of this pope would be followed by the most violent commotions. The Roman people, notorious for their turbulent spirit, were thoroughly determined that another Frenchman should not be pope, that no one should be chosen but an Italian, and an Italian of whom it might reasonably be expected that he would take up his residence in Rome. Among the cardinals themselves, too, a great schism could not fail to arise between those of Italian and those of French descent. The latter longed to get back to Avignon, or if they were still there, were not inclined to leave France, and it was not to be expected that they would consent to choose an Italian. But neither could the Italian cardinals be easily induced to consent to the choice of a Frenchman. As it was not difficult to foresee the disturbances which would be likely to interrupt the election of a new pope, Gregory XI. had, previous to his death, issued a bull suspending the ordinances then in force relating to the form of the papal election, and decreeing that the cardinals should be at liberty, in case of need, to meet for this election in some place without the walls of Rome, and to proceed directly, without waiting for their absent colleagues, to the choice of a pope, and that he who had the majority of votes should immediately enter upon his office. But it was not so easy to carry this bull into effect. For what could induce the turbulent Roman people to permit the cardinals to leave Rome for the express purpose of proceeding to the election in another place less exposed to the influences which the Romans would be very glad to exercise?

As it regards the events that followed, to determine the course which they actually took, belongs among the most difficult problems of historical criticism. The reports bear on their very face the stamp of opposite party-interests; on the one side an interest to magnify the dangers which the cardinals imagined they had reason to apprehend from the menacing posture of the Roman people, with a view to represent the election that had taken place under such influences as forced, and therefore null

and void; on the other side, an interest to keep out of sight everything that implied constraint, with a view to establish the validity of the election as one altogether regular. We have good cause, no doubt, to look upon both these classes of reports as liable, for different reasons, to suspicion, and to be on our guard against exaggerations on one side as well as on the other. By abstracting a little from both sides, we shall be most likely to succeed in making some approximation towards the truth. It may readily be conceived that the uneasy Romans would not be disposed to remain quiet, and patiently await the issue of the election; that desperately opposed as they were to the choice of a Frenchman, they would do all they could by playing upon the fears of the cardinals, to prevent them from making such a choice; nor would it probably have required a very great effort, to produce the necessary degree of terror in the enervated and effeminate body of men of whom we are speaking, to excite in them that fear of death, which in the customary phraseology of those times was called a *Metus qui cadit etiam in constantem virum.* But from this it does not follow, that the pope's election was a forced one, a sham election, even though it may have been true that the cardinals, under different influences, would have made a different choice. We should endeavour to present distinctly before us the relations then existing among the cardinals in order to understand the reasons which really led to the choice that was made. There were twenty-three cardinals, of whom seventeen were French. Six of these had remained behind in Avignon. Now the clamour of the Romans, demanding that a Roman, or at least an Italian should be pope,[1] produced, doubtless, a not unimportant impression on the French cardinals constituting the majority. But in addition to this, a coalition party had been formed; a circumstance which, as often happens, brought about a result that under other circumstances was not to be expected; but a result too, which, for the very reason that it had proceeded from nothing but such a coalition, might easily excite discontent. Among the French themselves, there were two parties, one which was determined to have a pope from the province of Limoisin, another which protested

1 Romano lo volemo o almanco Italiano, according to the report of the French party, Boulay hist. univers. Paris t. iv. f. 470.

against such a choice. Now the latter, merely from opposition to the former, might prefer to go with the Italians in electing an Italian pope. The individual on whom they united was a man to whom no great importance was attached by any body; a man who untilt his time had been known only for his rigid ascetic bent, who had occupied himself with nothing but the administration of his episcopal office—a man from whom no party felt that it had anything to fear. This was archbishop Prignano of Bari, a Neapolitan, who took the name of Urban VI. The cardinals, in their circular letters, announced this choice as an undoubtedly regular one; and they gave notice of it to their absent colleagues at Avignon. But no great stress, we must allow, is to be laid on the declarations of a college, composed of so many heartless and utterly corrupt men. While they thus expressed themselves publicly, one of the French cardinals wrote secretly to the French king that no declaration which they might make, whilst they remained in Rome, was to be relied upon; for they were governed by the fear of the Roman people.[1] Yet Urban VI. would probably, by a wise and prudent course of conduct, have been able to secure peace and unanimity. But he ruined everything, by the haughty bearing which he assumed, and by his indiscreet and passionate behaviour. The cardinals found him to be an entirely different man from what they had expected. They were the more exasperated against him on this account; and many, who for other reasons had been unwilling to recognize an Italian, now only looked about for an opportunity to get rid of him. The disaffected complained of the hot season of the year, as a pretext for leaving Rome. They betook themselves to Anagni. There, before the archbishop of Arles, chamberlain of the Roman Church, they solemnly protested against the validity of Urban's election. They declared it to have been made under constraint. In a circular letter they declared it to have been their expectation that Urban himself, knowing the invalidity of his election, would never think of calling himself pope. They declared him, therefore, to be a disturber of the peace of the church, a perjured man, a destroyer of Christendom; and they

1 Thus relates the then Vice-Chancellor of the University of Paris, Master Henry, of Langenstein in Hessia, called Henricus de Hessia, in his Dialogue de Schismate as Boulay reports in his hist. Univers. Paris, t. iv. f. 463.

forbade obedience to him as pope, under penalty of the ban. Next, they repaired to a place of security, to Ferredi, for the purpose of proceeding to a new election, when three Italians joined themselves to the French cardinals. At this election they assuredly did not direct their attention to any of the qualifications, spiritual or clerical, requisite for such an office; but they looked about only for a man who could best serve their purposes, and made choice of one whose chief title to importance was his relationship to princely families, and the large stretch of his conscience.[1] This was the Cardinal bishop Robert of Cambray who named himself pope Clement VII.

This was the beginning of the forty years' schism in the Western church, one of the most important of the links in the chain of events, which contributed to the overthrow of the papal absolutism of the middle age, and to prepare for the great reaction of the christian mind which took place in the sixteenth century. We have, indeed, seen already in earlier times schisms occasioned by the election of a pope; these, however, were of no long duration; nor did they lead to any such deeply cut division in the church. The way in which this schism arose is evidence in itself of the great corruption of the cardinals; and as the corruption of a part is ever closely connected with some defect of the whole, and presents a good reason for inferring a common guilt; so it was in the present case with regard to the general condition of the church. If, already, during the residence of the popes at Avignon, the abuses in the church had spread so widely, and risen to so enormous a pitch, yet all became still worse during this schism and by means of it. As the dominion of each of the two popes was circumscribed in its province, and as each must maintain his state in contending with the other, so they were forced to resort to still greater extortions than had ever been practised, to the complete prostration of the church. Simony, and the mischief of indulgences, arbitrary will in selecting candidates for ecclesiastical offices, got more and more the upper hand. But it seems to have been necessary that the corruption of the church should reach its highest point, in order to make every one sensible of it, and to awaken a more general attention to the

[1] Largae conscientiae, as Theodoric of Niem, then the pope's chamberlain in Rome, calls it, in his work de schismate lib. 1, cap. 10.

causes of so great an evil. An examination free from all bias would undoubtedly have led to the conclusion that Urban's election was regularly conducted; and in the reasons brought forward to prove the contrary it is impossible not to see a great deal that is sophistical. But as national party interest soon mixed itself in with this inquiry, while Urban VI. did everything, *on his part*, to excite the prejudices of men against him, so there might be much sharp fighting on both sides, with the weapons of that sort of polemical warfare, which is waged in behalf of opposite inclinations; and as important men were to be seen on both sides, it would be found so much the more difficult for those who were governed only by the authority of names, to decide who was true pope. And when men had continued for a long time to be in doubt as to who was the true pope, the faith in the necessity of one visible head would necessarily become unsettled. It was impossible to put an end to the mischievous schism so long as the traditional forms and principles of ecclesiastical laws were tenaciously adhered to. It was necessary to recognize a tribunal still higher even than the pope, in order at length to bring the contests between the conflicting parties to a decision. Accordingly it was necessary to turn away from papal absolutism to the principles of the ancient and freer ecclesiastical law. But it was necessary also that it should be clearly understood, that the schism was not the only, nor yet the principal evil of the church. It was necessary in fine to recognize in all this only a symptom of a still more deeply lying corruption. It was necessary to come to this, to be conscious that the schism itself was an admonition from God ca ing upon men to examine into the causes of the corruption of t..e church, and to begin to prepare the way for its regeneration. The question was whether by the united efforts of the most important forces so deep-rooted an evil of the church could be healed, or whether all these efforts would prove fruitless, and thus serve only to fix deeper the conviction that the church needed a far different and more radical cure. Under these more favourable circumstances, it became possible for that party so long suppressed, which in contending for the liberties of the national churches, and the independence of the episcopal system, had first stood forth to oppose the growth and formation of papal absolutism, once more to stand up in the

struggle with that absolutism which now formed the nucleus for all the corruptions of the church. This freer tendency had its seat more particularly in France, and in this country it had continued to maintain the struggle for the longest time. It was from this country more particularly, therefore, that a reaction of this sort against the mediæval papacy now proceeded again. The theologians of the University of Paris, a body of men whose voice had the most important influence in all affairs of general moment, were the most prominent representatives and organs of the same. Whilst, however, this party confined itself simply to the reform of the church constitution, holding fast to the foundation of the churchly theocratical system, and seeking only to clear away from it the rubbish of later additions, another was gradually developing itself, inclined to a more thorough and radical species of reform, hostile to this conservative element, a party which attacked the reigning system at its very foundation, demanding a regeneration of the church on the basis of the original christian principles, foretokening the renovated and christian spirit, which afterwards broke triumphantly forth in the German Reformation. Of this the great movements began in England and Bohemia; Wickliff and Huss were the representatives of it; and had it not been for that schism within the church, that enfeeblement of the papal power brought about by its partition, neither could these movements have arisen, and developed themselves to the extent which they did.[1]

The new pope Clement repaired once more to Avignon, and sought to gain over to his side the voice of France. Not till after a careful examination of the claims of the two popes before an assembly of the Gallic church held at Vincennes, did King Charles, with the whole church, declare in favour of Clement. The University of Paris was inclined at first to acknowledge neither of the two individuals who had been elected, but declaring itself neutral to propose a general council which should investigate the whole affair and bring it to a decision. It was predicted that unless this were done, the seeds of schism would every day become more widely disseminated. It is true, the university yielded on

1 Henry of Hessia in his epistola pacis: Sic orbem divisum, up sapientia fulgeat apud Gallicos, aurum abundet apud Italicos et fortitudo militum apud Germanos. Boulaeus iv. f. 576.

the whole to the decisions of the council of Vincennes, and to the invitation of the king, who was desirous of having the concurrence of the university in those decisions; yet a minority still held fast to their previous opinions. The whole church was divided into three parties, the Urbanists, Clementines, and neutrals or indifferents. At Paris, Henry of Hessia stood at the head of the latter party. He composed, under the title of Epistola pacis, a work in the form of a dialogue, between an Urbanist and Clementist, each of whom presents the arguments of his own party. After having placed the arguments of these parties one against the other, he sums up with the following declaration: "There is no other means of restoring on a solid basis the peace of the church but the meeting of all the prelates in a general council. Without this, the minds of men, even though one of the two popes should obtain the ascendancy, could not be set at rest for any great length of time. The same doubts would arise again about the succession of one or the other of them.[1]

In the year 1381, the assembled heads of the University of Paris came to the resolution that it was best to insist upon the calling of a general council for the purpose of healing the schism, and that they would use their utmost endeavours to prevail upon the princes and prelates to resort to this method.[2] The first to lift up his voice for the calling of a general council as the only sure means of restoring peace to the church, was the above-mentioned Henry of Langenstein in Hessia, professor of theology at Paris, in his "Counsel of Peace," a work composed by him in the year 1381.[3]

He looks upon the evils that had sprung out of this schism as an admonition from God, designed to bring men to a consciousness of the corruption of the church, and to lead them to seek earnestly after the necessary reform.[4] He thus addresses the princes and prelates; "Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, repent and do works meet for repentance for the

1 Extract from the work in Bulaeus. Tho end f. 578: Absquo cujus conventu credo vix unquam posse ad plenum corda quietari omnium.

2 This, Henry of Hessia cites in his Consilium pacis c. 13, in Hermann Von der Hardt Conc. Const. t. ii., f. 33.

3 Consilium pacis.

4 C. 3. Hanc tribulationem a Deo non gratis permissam, sed in necessariam opportunamque ecclesiae reformationem finaliter convertendam.

evils and sins which have been the cause of this schism." He notices the objections, which on the position held by the advocates of the old papal absolutism were raised against the assembling of a general council, and endeavours to invalidate them, first by assuming the position itself from which these objections proceeded, as his point of departure, and then by opposing to it a higher christian position. We see in France the same principles employed in reference to civil and to ecclesiastical law. As the civilians proceeded on the assumption, that the weal of the state at large was the highest law, to which the kingly power itself must be subservient, and attributed to the collective body the right to revolt against and depose a ruler who, by the abuse of his power, should act contrary to the well-being of the whole, so the opponents of papal absolutism ascribed the same power to the church at large in relation to bad popes.[1] And this power was to be exercised precisely by a general council, which represented the whole church. Such a council, which might be convoked even by the collective body of cardinals, must derive its authority directly from Christ himself, the eternal and immutable Head of the church, and pass its resolutions in *his* name. Christ, the author regards as the supreme, the only unconditionally necessary Head of the church, standing with it in indissoluble union; the head from which the church, his mystical body, derives incessantly the movement and spirit of life. Hence she cannot err, nor as a whole be stained with any mortal sin. To the complete organism of the church, should also belong, it is true, the papacy, as a *caput secundarium*. Yet in case of a vacancy in the papal chair, or of doubt as to what person was true pope, the absence of that "secondary head" must admit of being supplied by Christ as the Head inseparable from the church. To the gift of Constantine the author traces, in great part, the corruption of the church; though he acknowledges that it may have been a necessary or salutary thing for the church at a *certain stage* of its progress. For by means of it she became overladen with honour, power and wealth; and hence it came about that so many, without distinc-

1 Henry's own words: Ac si in nullo casu liceret populo vel alicui sine auctoritate principis contra statuta communia pro defensione sui et paternarum legum militare, seu principi volenti rempublicam et civium universitatem destruere, ad cujus conservationem est constitutus, tamquam hosti non regi resistere. C. 15 f. 42.

tion, foolish and wise, boys and old men, bad and good, by right and by wrong, eagerly sought after the fat benefices of the church. He suggests many single projects of reform, which should be discussed by the general council. Among these belongs the renewal of the provincial synods, to be biennially convened: the doing away with the superfluous pomp of the prelates and cardinals, which was so great, as to lead them sometimes to forget they were men; some provision against the bad management of patronage and appointments to ecclesiastical offices. He felt it necessary to complain that many but moderately educated persons held five, six, or eight benefices, though not worthy of holding even one. "See to it," says he, "whether horses, hounds, falcons and the superfluous domestics of the clergy, may not at the present time, far more than the christian poor, be eating up the heritage of the church."

Urban VI. was, at the beginning, the pope recognized in the majority of the kingdoms. The places of those cardinals who had abandoned him, he supplied by new appointments. But he ruined his cause by his own passionate wilfulness and extreme imprudence. He had brought it about, that Duke Charles of Durazzo should be made king of Naples. But after this he fell into a quarrel with that prince, because he refused to comply with the pope's wishes in promoting one of his worthless nephews. He himself with the cardinals repaired to Naples, for the purpose of working upon that prince by his personal influence. In this, however, he did not succeed, but was drawn into a quarrel with Charles which daily grew more bitter. He was closely besieged in a castle; and here all he could do was to go through the idle farce of stepping twice every day to a window, and pronouncing the ban on the whole army. At length he was set free by a Genoese fleet and transported to Genoa. Several cardinals, who had grown tired of the worthless conduct of their pope, and of the humiliations which he thus drew down upon himself, consulted with one another as to the best method of placing the pope under surveillance, and so circumscribing his power, as to keep him from such indiscreet steps. Urban having been informed of this, caused the suspected cardinals to be arrested. His vengeance knew no bounds. He employed the rack to lay bare the whole conspiracy. Thus he made himself more hateful every day, and

promoted the cause of his opponent. Urban, who died in the year 1389, was succeeded by Boniface IX., a man destitute of every moral quality, as well as the knowledge requisite for an ecclesiastical office. His ruling passion was the love of money. All means were right to him which could minister to this passion. The well-being of the church went with him for nothing. As Theodoric of Niem reports, he was ignorant of all business in the Roman chancery, and hence approved of everything that happened to be laid before him.[1] "In secular things"—says the same writer—"he was not a little fortunate; but weak in spiritual things."[2] When mass was celebrated before him in the midst of many assembled prelates, this or that secretary would ever and anon be coming to him, to make some report about pecuniary matters, which to him were the most momentous of all.[3]

His accession to office happened at a time which might bring large accessions of gain to one who did nothing but make traffic of spiritual things to the ruin of the church. Pope Clement VI. had, as we have remarked, already reduced the time of the jubilee to fifty years. It was probably the hope of gain that induced Urban VI. to shorten the time to thirty-three years. He died on the very year when this period returned, and left the fruits to his successor. An innumerable multitude from Germany, Hungary, Poland, Bohemia, England, and other kingdoms where Urban was acknowledged, came together in Rome, and large oblations were presented in the churches. Some portion was used for the reconstruction of ruined church edifices. But the major part came into the hands of Boniface and many others. Not contented with this, Boniface sent[4] letters of indulgence and preachers of indulgence into all countries. These agents sold the indulgence to all who gave the same sum as by computation the

1 L. 2 de schismate c. 6: Ignoravit gravitatem pontificalis officii, et adeo supplicationes sibi propositas indiscrete signavit, ac si nunquam fuisset in Romana curia constitutus, nec quae petebantur in ipsis intellexit, et propositiones factas coram eo per advocatos in ejus consistorio toto tempore sui pontificatus non intelligens ad petita nimis confuse respondit, unde inscitia fere vernalis facta fuit in curia tempore suo.

2 L. 2 c. 13: In temporalibus non mediocriter fortunatus, sed in spiritualibus debilis.

3 L. c. c. 11.

4 Theodoric of Niem says of him, in this connection: Erat enim insatiabilis vorago et in avaritia nullus ei similis. Lib. 1 c. 68.

journey to Rome would have cost them. Thus the sellers of indulgences were enabled to bring back from many countries more than a hundred thousand florins; and inasmuch as they bargained off their indulgences, which to the people appeared the same as forgiveness of sins, without requiring penitence, they laid the foundation of immense mischief.[1] For money one might obtain from them, by virtue of the power to bind and loose, which they claimed for themselves, all sorts of dispensation. Enriched, they returned back in great state to Rome. Many of them Boniface caused to be arrested, on the charge of embezzlement. Theodoric of Niem remarks, that several of these people came to a bad end, either falling victims to the fury of the people, or committing suicide. "It was befitting"—says he—"that they who so deceived the christian people, when they were only serving their own cupidity, should perish miserably.[2] Simony and extortion from the churches reached, under this pope, their highest pitch." In the first seven years[3] he was still somewhat restrained from respect to the better disposed among the cardinals, and pursued the traffic more clandestinely. No sooner, however, had these better persons died than he cast off all further shame. With a view to cover simony under some show of law, he made it a rule, that none should obtain the more important ecclesiastical offices, without first advancing a sum of money, which, by the estimate of the Roman chancery, should equal the income of the first year, the so called *annates*. But now the same amount was required even for the expectancy; and thus many paid the money, who never came into actual possession of the office. All sorts of usury became common to meet the expenses of such a purchase. Many vagabond monks roved idly about Rome, seeking promotion, which by bad arts might easily be obtained at that time at the Roman court. The most worthless of men could get promoted to the highest posts. The *Bonifacian plantation*, as it was called, a phrase to denote the most corrupt members of the clergy, became a by-word in every man's mouth.

1 Theodoric of Niem Ibid: Quia omnia peccata etiam sine poenitentia ipsis confitentibus relaxaverunt.

2 Justum erat, ut hi, qui taliter Christianum populum deceperint, eorum avaritiae consulentes male perderentur.

3 2, 7.

Meantime the University of Paris did not cease to carry on its work according to the principles, which, in this affair, they had expressed from the beginning; and they lent all their energies to bring about the restoration of peace to the church, and the reformation of its abuses. They kept an incessant and attentive watch over the conduct of the two popes. But the political relations of the kingdom were unfavourable to them—the regency during the minority of King Charles VI. of France, and afterwards his mental derangement. Clement found in Cardinal Peter de Luna of Arragon, a very skilful and able negotiator, by whose means he endeavoured to form a party among the French princes, and without sticking at bribery, to set influences at work against the university. Finally, the latter contrived in spite of all difficulties to carry out their object; and in the year 1394 obtained license to set forth publicly before the king their opinion respecting the most appropriate method of restoring tranquillity to the church. From their own number was chosen a distinguished man, to draw up the judgment, Nicholas of Clemangis, so named from his native place, Clamanges in Champagne, belonging to the diocese of Chalons sur Marne. He was educated at the Paris university, became a member of the collegium of Navarre, was master of the liberal arts, then Baccalaureus of Theology, and a disciple of the Chancellor Gerson. He was even more distinguished than that great man for enlarged views and classical culture. In his theological tendency he was not cramped and confined within the common limits of the University of Paris, as we shall hereafter perceive. In the judgment drawn up by his pen, and which he presented to the king at the head of a deputation from the university, we recognize his own spirit and style.

There were three methods, among which the university left freedom for choice; that both popes should, for the good of the church, resign; that they should submit their respective claims to the investigation of chosen and approved men; or the meeting of a general council.[1]

This council should, according to the then current legal form, consist of prelates exclusively; or else inasmuch as these, to

1 The via cessionis, compromissi aut concilii generalis. The judgment in Bulae. l. l. Pag. 687 sq.

their shame and reproach,[1] were for the most part ignorant, and several of them too partial[2] to one or the other side, there must be joined with the prelates, in equal number, masters and doctors of theology and of law from the universities; or, if these were not enough, delegates should be added from the cathedral churches, the chapters, and the monastic orders. Next, the right to the meeting of a general council is defended against the arguments alleged to the contrary by the advocates of the old church doctrine. Although this method had been objected to as an unsuitable one, by some flatterers and promoters of this monstrous schism, from its beginning down to the present time, rather to nourish the disorder than to act according to the judgment of truth; yet whoever would examine into the matter without prejudice, must see that this method was by no means so objectionable. There was, indeed, so much the more need of a general council, at a time when discipline, manners, and good order had, by the operation of this mischief-bringing schism, sunk to the lowest ebb, and so many abuses had crept abroad, that if the church were not soon helped, she must be plunged in irremediable ruin. "Too late"—he exclaims, addressing the popes,—"will it repent you to have looked about after no remedies. If now, when it stands in your power, you do not see the near-impending dangers, who do you suppose will still be willing to endure such government of the church? Who to bear these extortions and wrongs of the church—who, these cheap promotions of all the worthless and the most ignorant to all the highest dignities? You deceive yourselves, assuredly you deceive yourselves, if you suppose that this will long be tolerated in you. If men will not see it, or seeing it, will be silent, the very stones shall cry out against you."

To the question, whence comes the authority of a council, he answers—"The consent and agreement of all the faithful will confer it, Christ in the Gospel confers it, when he says, 'Where two or three are gathered in my name, I am in the midst of them.'"

After a full explanation of the above-mentioned three methods for the restoration of unity, it is declared: Whichever of the

1 Quia plures eorum proh pudor! hodie satis illiterati sunt. Pag. 690.

2 Pluresque ad alterutram partem inordinate affecti.

two popes refuses to adopt one of these three methods, or to propose some other, is to be regarded as an obstinate schismatic, and therefore a heretic. He is no shepherd of the church, but a tyrant, and must no longer be obeyed.

The king is most earnestly called upon to do all in his power for the restoration of peace to the church; to make all secular affairs give way to this. To this end, the evils that had resulted from the schism are minutely pourtrayed. In connection with this, to be sure, we find it erroneously assumed—for it is an error according to the history as we have presented it—that the church down to the time of this schism had been in a flourishing condition. But this statement is somewhat modified; for the existing evils are not imputed directly and solely to the schism itself, but in part also to the preceding state of things; so that a time of corruption may accordingly be marked, which existed previous to the schism.[1] Worthless and wicked men had been promoted to the government of the church, and were still promoted to the same; men to whom nothing was sacred; by whose disgraceful acts and in ministration to whose pleasures, the churches were drained, the monasteries plundered. The priests were seen begging, or they were employed on the most menial and degrading services. The church utensils of gold and silver were in many places sold to eke out those extortions. How many churches had been brought to ruin! He complains of the simony which had occasioned the worst appointments to spiritual offices. It was not the learned who received promotion; but the more learned men were, the more were they detested, because by such simony was more boldly castigated than by others. As the most wicked abuse of all, to describe which language scarcely strong enough could be found, he signalises the abuse in the administration of the sacraments, especially of ordination and of penance.[2] Nothing was to be said about the curtailment of the liberties of the church, and the loss of its goods, for they were only temporals; although, in these times, temporals were regarded as of the greater importance.[3]

1 Quid ante hoc schisma schismatisque præambula ecclesia florentius? Pag. 693.

2 Et quod iniquissimum est, nec satis exaggerari verbis potest, hæc est, quæ damnatissima corruptela sacramentorum omnium injustas collationes et præcipue ordinum ac pœnitentiæ turpi detestabilique quæstu vendit. Pag. 694.

3 Quamquam majora isti hæc temporalia judicant.

The university next defended itself against the reproach that it chose to inveigh against the pope, (for whose honour the university should be more zealous than all others), from its ambition to govern all things, especially in the church, according to its will. They who cast upon the university this reproach—it was said—were endeavouring to maintain the schism in the church, for their own emolument; for, in any well-ordered condition of the church, they would find it impossible to secure so many and fat benefices.[1] It is true, said the university, they do not want to govern the church; they prefer to let themselves be governed; but they do want on the other hand to practise extortions, to destroy and rend the churches. And because, constrained by our own conscience and the truth, we cannot remain silent at this, because we are neither willing nor able to bear it with equanimity, it is for this reason that they, in so great danger of the church, have fabricated such charges against us. Does it become us to keep silence, where the very stones ought to cry out?

When the university presented this writing, they received at first an evasive answer. But when they pressed for a more decided declaration, they received for answer, It was the king's pleasure that they should neither treat nor consider this matter any farther, that they should not receive nor open any letters relating to it, until they had first been shown to the king. Upon this the university carried into effect the resolution previously passed, that sermons and lectures should be suspended by all their members until satisfaction was given to their demands.[2] Next, the university addressed to the pope a very frank and bold letter, in which they strongly protested against the intriguing conduct of the Cardinal Peter de Luna, without mentioning his name, and urgently besought him to do all in his power to put a speedy end to the schism; so that this schism—which God avert—might not become an everlasting one, for the thing had already come to that pass, that men were heard openly to say, it made no sort of difference how many popes there were. There might be not two or three only, but even twelve. Each realm might

1 Magnas quippe dignitates et crassa beneficia in hac turbata ecclesia assequuntur, quas integra ac unita se nunquam adipisci posse et merito confiderent. Pag. 695.

2 Bulaeus, l. c. pag. 696.

have its own ecclesiastical superior; and each of these might be independent of the others.[1]

It is clear from this, how the being accustomed to have no generally acknowledged pope, had already had the effect of leading men to think, that perhaps one universal visible head of the church was a thing not necessary. The pope, it is said, manifested great indignation in reading this letter—calling it, as was reported to the university, a malignant and venomous letter.[2] The university thereupon issued a second letter to the pope, vindicating itself from this reproach, and showing that they had acted out of pure zeal for the welfare of the church, still expressing themselves, however, with great freedom. But Clement was already dead. Now, if it had been possible at this juncture to prevent a new papal election on this side, the removal of the schism would thereby have been greatly facilitated. The university of Paris endeavoured to bring this about by letters and delegates sent to the king, and directly afterwards to the college of cardinals: but they could effect nothing. The cardinals at Avignon only made more haste to complete their election, so as to frustrate this design. They thought themselves bound to maintain their rights against the other party. Yet before proceeding to the election, they pledged themselves[3] to use every effort to bring about the restoration of peace to the church, and agreed that whichever one of them should be chosen pope, he would not hesitate, if it should be necessary to effect that end, to resign his dignity. The already named Cardinal Peter de Luna of Arragon, a man far superior to his predecessors, at least in clerical dignity, plausible manners, and the art of managing men, was chosen pope. He called himself Benedict XIII. He had been, earlier, professor of the canon law at Montpellier, and had enjoyed a good reputation.[4] Gregory XI. made him cardi-

1 Ut plerumque passim et publice non vereantur dicere Nihil omnino curandum, quot Papae sint, et non solummodo duo aut tres, sed decem aut duodecim, imo et singulis regnis singulos praefici posse, nulla sibi invicem potestatis aut jurisdictionis auctoritate praelatos. L. 1. pag. 700.

2 Malae sunt et venenosae. L. 1. pag. 701.

3 The form is to be found in Bulae. l. c. f. 730.

4 Theodoric of Niem writes concerning him, from an acquaintance with him thirty-six years before at Montpellier: Homo ingeniosus et ad inveniendum res novas valde subtilis. Cf. l. 2, c. 33.

nal.[1] He had, thus far, as Theodoric of Niem says, manifested great zeal for the restoration of the unity of the church. When employed by Pope Clement on embassies, he had found fault, because the pope did nothing for the restoration of concord to the church. But his administration of the papacy did not answer the expectations which his previous conduct may have inspired. He utterly ignored the pledge which he had given before he assumed the papal dignity. He did not recognize the form of that oath, when sent to him, as genuine, and asserted that a pope could not be bound.[2]

In the year 1401,[3] Nicholas of Clemangis composed his remarkable book *on the corruptions of the Church*, in which he sets forth these corruptions, affecting all portions of the church, in the darkest colours, and yet most assuredly in accordance with the truth. He, too, not only considers the schism as a consequence of the corruptions in the church, but also as a means designed to bring men to the consciousness of them. "Who does not know"—says he— "that this frightful pest of schism was first introduced into the church by the wickedness of the cardinals, that by them it has been promoted, propagated, and enabled to strike its roots so deep."[4] "If"—says he—"all kingdoms however mighty, great and exalted, have been prostrated to the dust by injustice and pride, how knowest thou"—so he addresses the church —"when thou hast cast far from thee the firm rock of humility thou wast founded on, and which feared no storm of invasion, and hast lifted thy horn on high, that such a fabric of pride erected by thyself, will not be overthrown? Already has thy pride, which could not sustain itself, begun slowly and gradually to fall, and on this account its fall was not perceived by the

1 Theodoric of Niem says of him: Qui tunc satis dilegebatur a multis, eo quod peritus et virtuosus existeret, a pluribus laudabatur.

2 Du Boulay, p. 729, cites the letter of the pope to the king of France: Respondemus, quod qui tibi vel aliis ista scripserunt, vel quomodolibet retulerunt, minus veridice id egerunt, et propterea dictam copiam, quam confictam esse constanter asserimus, tibi remittimus. It bids the cardinals, pag. 731, ne in dicta schedula vos subscribatis, nec etiam consentiatis aliqualiter aliis, quae non licent seu non decent, seu ex quibus occasio forte posset deprehendi, quod contra reverentiam, obedientiam aut honorem nobis et ecclesiae Romanae per vos debitas, seu laudabiles mores inter nos et vos, praedecessores nostros et vestros observari consuetos aliqua fierent.

3 As he himself says in the book de ruina ecclesiae c. 16,—H. v. d. Hardt tom. i., pars iii. pag. 18, when the division had already lasted nearly twenty-three years.

4 C. 16.

majority. But now thou art wholly plunged in the gulf, and especially since the breaking out of this abominable schism. Most surely has the divine anger permitted this to come upon thee as a check to thy intolerable wickedness, that thy domination so displeasing to God, so odious to the nations, may, by being divided within itself, come to nought." Not that the true faith would run any hazard in this conflict of contending churches in the world; this being founded upon the firm rock would remain unshaken; but it was otherwise with all that temporal power, glory and pleasure, wherewith the church was overladen even to loathing and the forgetfulness of herself.[1] As the cessation of the synagogue followed close upon the destruction of Jerusalem, so the fall of Rome as seat and head of the church, seemed to indicate that the destruction of the church herself and her dominion might be near at hand. For how could she long subsist, who, deprived of her original seat and head, was obliged to roam about fugitive and inconstant, and like a stranger in the world wander from one place to another. She must have foreseen her impending fall, since the time that, detested for her fornication, she fled from Rome to Avignon; where, in proportion to her greater freedom, she more openly and shamelessly exposed to view the ways of her simony and profanation, bringing foreign and perverted manners, the source of infinite mischief, into France. Where good manners and severe discipline once reigned, immoderate luxury had, by her means, now begun to spread. Holding up the synagogue as an antetype of the church, he bids the latter take warning by the fate of the former. Then he addresses the church: "Awake, for once, from thy long sleep, O wretched sister of the synagogue! Awake, I say, at last, for once; and set a limit to thy intoxication, which it might take thee long enough, so to speak, to sleep out! If one spark of a sound understanding still remains in thee, search diligently into the writings of the prophets, and know from them that the hour of thy shame is no longer at a distance, but close by. Thou wilt see what an end awaits thee; and how evil and dangerous it is for thee to lie long in this filth."[2] He describes[3]

1 Loquor de temporali potentatu, de gloria et deliciis, quibus usque ad nauseam et oblivionem sui ipsa ecclesia obruta est. Cap. 42.

2 Cap. 41.

3 Cap. 42

into what ignominious dependance on the French court, Clement VII. had cast himself; how he was compelled to sacrifice the good of the church to the interests of the French princes. He speaks of the scandalous bargaining away of benefices. "What poorer creature"—says he—"was there than our Clement as long as he lived, who had so debased himself to the condition of a servant of servants to the princes of France, that such threats and scornful language were daily heaped upon him by the people of the court, as ought not to be borne by the most miserable slave! He gave way to their rage, he gave way to the time, he gave way to clamorous demands. He used falsehoods, disguises; gave splendid promises; put off with fair hopes from one day to another. To some he gave benefices, others he held at bay with words. All who by the art of flattery or of playing the buffoon, had made themselves agreeable to the court, he took every pains to please, and to secure their favour by benefices, in order that by the good offices of such he might make sure of the favour of their master." On the handsome and well dressed young men, in whose companionship he most delighted, he had bestowed nearly all the vacant bishoprics and other most honourable posts. The more easily to secure and preserve the goodwill of the princes, he had himself and without solicitation sent them presents, allowed them to practise any extortions they chose on the clergy, nay even invited them to do so at their pleasure. In this most deplorable servitude, which could not be called a government of the church, he had spent more than fifteen years, inflicting an injury on the church, surpassing all belief.

He goes through the several orders and offices of the church for the purpose of pointing out the corruption in them all. He describes[1] the worldly pride and state of the cardinals, who, when they had been raised from the lowest rank and from the humblest offices to that highest dignity, as for example, from the condition of grave-diggers, wholly forgot what they once were, and looked down upon all the other spiritual offices of the church with disdain. He reproached them with their luxurious habits of living;[2] accused them of grasping at all the benefices, of practising simony. He speaks[3] of the bad appointments

1 Cap. 13.

2 Immensa et inexcusabilis vorago concupiscentiae.

3 Cap. 7

to benefices proceeding from the Roman chancery, which had usurped everything to itself. Not from studious pursuits and the school alone, but from the plough, and from menial employments, individuals were here and there called to the guidance of parishes and to the other benefices; men who understood little more of Latin than they did of the Arabic language; nay, men who could not even read, and shame to say, hardly knew the alphabet. But may they not perhaps have made amends for this ignorance by the excellence of their manners? Not in the least. Brought up without learning in idleness, they busied themselves only with looking out for their pleasures, feasting and sporting. Hence in all places, so many bad, wretched, ignorant priests, whose scandalous lives made them both offensive and sources of corruption to the communities. Hence the expressions of contempt for priests on the lips of all the people. While it was formerly the case, that with people of the world the priesthood stood in the highest honour, and nothing was considered more worthy of respect than this order, now nothing was considered more deserving of contempt. He complains[1] that the study of the Scriptures, and every man who engaged in that study, were ridiculed; and especially—which was most to be wondered at—by the bishops, who looked upon their own decrees as of vastly more importance than the divine precepts. That glorious office of preaching, the fairest of all offices, and which once belonged solely to the pastors, had sunk among them to so low esteem, that there was nothing they held to be more worthless, or less becoming their dignity. He points out[2] the mendicants as being almost the only persons that occupied themselves with the study of the Scriptures, that supplied the office of preaching, who alone, as they affirmed, administered the functions of all the church offices which were neglected by all others, alone represented that which by the vices, the ignorance and remissness of all the rest, had fallen into desuetude. But next he attacks these also, representing them as the genuine successors of the Pharisees described in the gospels, who, under their show of holiness, concealed all manner of wickedness. They were ravening wolves in sheep's clothing, who put on for outside show,

1 Cap. 19. 2 Cap. 33.

severity of life, chastity, humility, holy simplicity, but in secret abandoned themselves to the choicest pleasures, to a dainty variety of luxurious enjoyments. He acknowledges[1] that in the midst of the great mass of the bad members of the church there was doubtless also a good seed; since Christ had promised of the church at large, that her faith should not become utterly extinct; but in the midst of so many that were bad, the small number of the good vanished to a *point*. The proportion was scarcely one to a thousand. And whenever an individual in a community distinguished himself by his pious living, he was made a butt of ridicule for the rest, was pointed out as a proud man, a singular fellow, an insane person or a hypocrite; hence numbers from whom some good might come, had they been associated with the good, were in the society of the bad swept along into wickedness.

Clemangis saw more profoundly than others into the corruptions of the church, and its causes; and hence he placed but little confidence in the means employed for its removal. He was penetrated with a thorough conviction that the thing needed here was a deep-going process of purification, to be accomplished only by the wisdom and almighty power of God; and he saw that the evils which men vainly sought to heal by higher remedies, must in spite of all human expedients continually go on increasing to their fullest measure before that help could come from God. "Because"—says he—"the church, though torn and rent by so many calamities, refused to humble herself, she justly therefore must first be humbled by Him, who humbles whatever exalteth itself, and exalts the lowly, to the end that she may return back to the state of grace from which she has fallen. She must first be still more afflicted, still more smitten; not till then can she be healed."[2] "For"—says he—"as regards the restoration of the church, rent asunder by this unhappy schism, it is vain to hope that anything of this sort will be brought about by us. This can never be accomplished by man's work, never by any human art whatsoever. This thing requires of a certainty another hand. And if ever a union of the church shall take place, the physician that effects it must be He who gave the wound; for the wound

[1] Cap. 39, 40. [2] Cap 43.

is so grave and incurable as to be incapable of healing by any other pains. A great deal has been done on this subject, a great deal written; a great deal said; many embassies have been undertaken on account of it. But the more we have met and deliberated and proposed, the more complicated and obscure the matter has grown; for God mocks our pains, because we fancy ourselves able by our own prudence and skill, without *his* help, to accomplish what is his work alone. Add to this, that we are unworthy of receiving peace from him and of having peace; for God the Lord has said; "There is no peace to the wicked." He looks forward in expectation of a persecution of the church, sent as a divine judgment, and growing out of the schism. By this persecution coming from the secular power, the church would be deprived of the rights and possessions not her own which she had brought within her grasp, and reduced back to poverty. "This persecution," says he, "will come upon us sooner perhaps than many are aware. We might see the foundation already laid for it in various ways, were we not so blinded; and any man possessed of his senses may certainly see how this persecution threatens to break out more and more every day." Scanning with a prophetic eye the remote future as if it were near at hand, Clemangis predicts such a process of purification and such a revolution of the church, as subsequently proceeded from the Reformation. "What methods"—he concludes—"still remain in thy hands, O Christ, if thou wilt purify thy church from such dross as that into which its gold and silver have been converted? what other method, than that thou wilt finally purge away from the refining even this dross itself, which can by no refining fire be again transmuted into gold and silver, and prepare in it a new metal of untarnished purity?

In order clearly to understand how this distinguished man judges concerning the corruption of the church of his time, and concerning the means requisite for its cure, we should compare with this book a treatise which he addressed to a friend of his, who was candidate for a theological degree, and proposed to hold lectures on the *Sentences* at some university. This was his treatise on the *Study of Theology*.[1] He represents the chief end of theological study to be education for the office of preaching,

[1] De studio theologico in d'Achery's Spicilegium, vol. i., p. 473 sq.

In the neglect of this, he finds the principal cause of the corruption of the church. In the exercise of this office, we ought chiefly to imitate Christ; for his whole activity had consisted in teaching. "For sometimes"—says he—"Christ taught his disciples, sometimes the multitude, sometimes the Pharisees; occasionally he taught in the synagogue, often in the temple, sometimes on the land, sometimes on the water, sometimes on mountains, sometimes on the plains; oftentimes he taught many together; then again, individuals. Who should not say, then, that the best method is the one which Christ, the perfect pattern of all that is good, practised unceasingly while living in the flesh? But what is meant by being a teacher? What else than this; with the right art, with experience, and zeal for the cure of souls, to teach others? For it is not the square cap, not the higher pulpit that makes the doctor." "To the theologian or to the preacher"—says he—"for I look upon both as *one and the same*—it belongs, in particular, to live uprightly according to the will of God, that in the practice of this commandment, and in all life and conversation, he may furnish a pattern to all." He accordingly regards the practical element as the end and aim of theological study, and disputes a theologian of some eminence, who had asserted that to teach and dispute at the university, was something of higher note than to preach. "Since"—says he—"the end of theological study is to instruct in the right manner one's self and others in that which pertains to eternal life, so we may see which we should consider as most profitable and salutary, whether actively to discharge the predicatorial office in zeal for the salvation of souls, or after one has obtained the academical degree, to remain always at the university, teaching and disputing. What purpose"—says he—"is all this to serve? Certainly this purpose; to form others that they may be capable of leading the rest to salvation. Now if the means must correspond to the end, is it not better, by one's own preaching to lead others to salvation, than to educate such as are destined thus to operate on others, but will perhaps never do so?[1] Who must not see"—he says—"that it is better to banish errors out of the hearts of men, than out of books? In many things, the people at the present time stand at a very great distance in their ways of think-

1 Pag. 478.

ing from that which the true faith requires. They use magical arts; they are closely wrapt in various superstitions; they seek advice from fortune tellers; they are in error as to the majority of the articles of faith.[1] If there is much acute disputation against all this in the schools, of what avail is it to those who, remote from such places, hear nothing of all this, those whom no theologians ever come to instruct? Is not the physician who, after having learned the art, visits and heals the sick, more useful than he who never exercises the art, but only disputes in the schools?"[1] The cause, however, of the neglect of preaching, and the cause of the bad preaching in his own time, he finds in the false treatment of theology, as merely a matter of the understanding and not a matter of the heart; in the dislike of the study of the bible, in the one-sided scholastic tendency, in the fact that such a theology was pursued as could neither fill the heart with zeal for the preacher's office, nor render one qualified for its performance. He says—"We see most school theologians at the present time attributing so little weight to proofs drawn from the Scriptures, that they deride a proof grounded on such authority, as indicating a sluggish intellect, or want of acuteness; as if that were of more weight, which is excogitated by human invention, than what God had revealed from heaven." After citing the words in 2 Tim. iii. 16, he says: "Of little profit to that end are the things in which the majority exercise themselves at the present day; things which may indeed in some way or other serve to sharpen the intellect, but can neither warm the heart, kindle emotion in the soul, nor supply it with any nourishment, but leave it cold, hard, and withered."[2] Hence it is, that they are so indolent in discharging the preacher's office. They have never learned the science which ministers thereto. *This* is the true knowledge after which every theologian should strive, knowledge which not only informs the understanding, but at the same time takes hold on the affections."[3] He compares the theology of his

1 Pag. 479.

2 Ad quae illa sunt parum utilia, in quibus hodie plurimi exercentur, quae licet intellectum utcumque acuant, nullo tamen igne succendunt affectum, nullo motu excitant, nullo alimento pascunt, sed frigidum, torpentem, aridum relinquunt. Pag. 476.

3 Illa est vera scientia, quae theologum decet, quamque omnis debet theologus expetere, quae non modo intellectum instruat, sed infundat simul atque imbuat affectum. Ibid.

time to the apples of Sodom, which, seen from without, appeared fair, but within were only dust and ashes. Accordingly such a theology could never still the cravings of the spirit, however acute and ingenious it might appear. He calls upon his friend to study in particular the church fathers; but to regard these as only the rivulets, leading back to the fountain head of the holy Scriptures themselves. He already lays down the principle, that in matters of religion, nothing should be asserted which could not be proved out of the sacred Scriptures, where, by rightly searching, one would find everything necessary to be known in order to salvation.[1]

The predictions uttered by Clemangis, in his book De ruina ecclesiae, about the fruitless character of the means by which it was attempted to do away the schism, were more and more verified every day. The University of Paris issued a letter to Pope Benedict soon after his accession to office, calling upon him in the most pressing manner to set forward the cause of the union without any procrastination. He ought not to delay even for a moment. If he waited but a day, another would soon be added, and so the whole thing would pass into forgetfulness. Flatterers would come: men who, under the guise of friendship, instilled the deadliest poison. Men, ambitious for dignities; eager aspirants for promotions and benefices; all the courtiers who did homage to the power of the moment; and if to such he opened his ears, they would be ever drawing him farther and farther from this matter. United with all this would be the sweet custom of honour, best fitted of all things to entice and deceive him, as it had done with many, especially in these times. He had the latest example of this in his predecessor, who had by it alone been led to adhere so obstinately to the opinion he had once adopted. But if Benedict should advert to the fact, that all did not depend on him, that there was something incumbent also on the other pope, it was maintained on the other hand, that without the least doubt everything depended on his doing his own duty; and the other might be left to do the same, or, if he did not do it,

1 Quoniam in his quae divina sunt, nihil debemus temere definire, nisi ex coelestibus possit oraculis approbari: quae divinitus enuntiata de his, quae scitu de deo sunt necessaria, aut ad salutem opportuna, si diligentur investigarentur, nos sufficienter instruunt. Ibid.

he must inevitably make the wickedness of his course evident to all. The pope returned to this letter of the university, an answer couched in the most general terms, expressing his earnest desire of promoting the unity of the church, but at the same time excusing himself on the plea that all did not depend on him alone, and that he felt himself pledged to nothing.

To explain the fact, how the popes could for so long a time disappoint the earnest desires of all the well-disposed for the restoration of church-unity, and for a renovation of the church, now so deeply depressed, and to understand rightly the fluctuating, uncertain character of the negotiations entered into with them, we should have distinctly before our minds the relation of the parties by which they were influenced. As usually happens in passing from an old state of things to a new, three parties had sprung up: one, which was utterly unable to rid itself of the principles of the mediaeval ecclesiastical law, and of papal absolutism, and which ever eyed with suspicion all attempts to set another authority as judge over the pope; a second, which was disposed to carry out against the pope with reckless violence, and without sparing, the principles of the new ecclesiastical law now in the process of formation, according to which the popes should be subject to the control of general councils,—a party inclined to radical revolution; and the more prudent and moderate advocates of the new system, of the new liberty of the church, at whose head stood men like D'Ailly and Gerson. The French church itself, which laboured most zealously for the removal of the schism, and the reform of the church, was divided into these three parties, and their own contentions with each other promoted the interests of Pope Benedict, who possessed far more self-reliance and craft than his predecessors, and the popes of the other party, and who seems to have understood how to exercise a certain power over the minds of others. Opposed to the free spirit of the University of Paris was the tendency and bent of the University at Toulouse, which was still fast entangled in the old system. But in the University of Paris itself, those two parties,—the party inclined to radical measures, and the more moderate one, could not come to any agreement. The one wanted from the first to put an end to the crafty intrigues of Benedict, and with the aid of the secular power to break up his rule. They

would go the length of renouncing ecclesiastical obedience to him, thus compelling him to resign. A welcome thing to them it would be if the French church should for once subsist without a pope and govern itself. It might doubtless be the case also that, with many, worldly interests mixed in. The more prudent party dreaded a movement which, once set agoing, might lead farther than was at first proposed. With the theological faculty the considerations of mildness and forbearance had the most weight; but they easily yielded to the preponderance of the other faculties. Gerson, by his character and his principles, was no less violent in his opposition to all that appeared to him revolutionary in the evolution of the church, than he was to all slavish dependance of the church upon the popes, and the mean course, which appeared to him the only right one between the two extremes, he was for thrusting upon all. It might appear surprising, that the already mentioned Nicholas of Clemangis, the organ through whom the Paris university expressed its earlier free-spoken declarations against the pope, who, for freedom of mind stood far above all the Parisian theologians, and had ventured to break through the common limits of the Parisian theology, should not in this case, however, be at all satisfied with the bolder party which stood forth against Pope Benedict. But for the very reason that he saw so deeply into the corruption of the church and its causes, he could not indulge the hopes by which others allowed themselves to be deceived. He was convinced from the beginning, that something else must be relied on than human wisdom; that help was to be expected for the church from God alone. He feared that by all the attempts to cure, the evil might only be made worse. He was perfectly satisfied with neither one of the parties. In those who stood forth with the most freedom and boldness, he missed a pure and single interest for the well-being of the church; he believed that he saw selfish motives. He beheld little else but the contest of passions; he did not find the wisdom and calm collectedness that grew out of cool persuasion, by which alone the rightful cause could be ascertained. The conduct of Benedict's enemies appeared to him indelicate, passionate and unforbearing. He failed of seeing in it the respect which was due to the head of the church. Although in his theological tendency he was otherwise more free than the rest of the Parisian theologians, and

not trammelled by the fetters of scholasticism, yet he could not so easily as many others set himself beyond all respect for the papal office. He feared an indevout tendency, striving to break loose from the head of the church. He saw arbitrary will and a licentious freedom already spreading far and wide, in lieu of discipline and good order. He feared that in place of dependance on the popes, in whom he would by no means approve of the abuse of power, would be substituted a still more corrupting dependance on princes and courts. In view of such dangers as these which seemed to him to threaten the course of the party which proposed to break loose from Pope Benedict, he was from conviction an opponent of those violent steps against him. Add to this, that Clemangis could not in particular place the least confidence in those hopes which were built on the declaration of neutrality by France. He believed that by this divisions only would arise in their own party, and that the opposite elements, instead of being enfeebled, would gain strength. Neither would the abdication of Pope Benedict be of any use unless the other pope should resolve to do likewise, or his party were disposed to force him to it. Thus he feared that by division among themselves and consequent weakness, the other party would only become more confirmed and more haughty, while no issue would be reached. These considerations made him from the beginning and ever after an opponent of the proposed renunciation of Pope Benedict, and he held his position to the last, when *his* voice could no longer be heard against so many others, and what he would have prevented if he could, was still carried through. The consequences that ensued justified the views which had been expressed by him. Add to this, that Benedict, personally, had made a favourable impression on him. He was inclined to excuse the steps he had taken; he gave him credit for more interest in the welfare of the church than others did. He always carefully abstained from flattering the pope; he reminded him in the strongest language of his duty to the church. When the pope entered upon his office, Clemangis wrote him a letter upon that occasion, in 1394, explaining to him the point of view, such as we have already described it, under which he himself regarded the relations of the church at that time. "Far be from me"—he wrote—"any wish to flatter the pope, as from my early youth, this worst of pests, which commits

such frightful ravages on all common interests, has ever been to me an abomination. Plenty of those will appear before you, who, unused to speak the truth, and inflamed by a blind desire of benefices, will endeavour to flatter your ears with deceitful words. Would to God there were even but a few still left, fair and friendly enough, to tell you the truth which engenders hatred, which is unwelcome to the multitude, though welcome, as I hope, to your heart. I confess, that at the present moment, so far as in me lies, I am of this number, and so shall remain, should I address you any other letter in the future. I come not to petition you for benefices, not to speak to you about any interests of my own, but of yours. And with good truth may I call that *your* interest, which is the interest of the whole church, the guidance and administration of which God has now set before you." After reminding the pope of the compass and extent of his duties growing out of this relation of his to the church, he adds: "It will, however, be required of you from the Lord, whose vicar you are, to give an account of so much the more, as you and your predecessors have taken on your shoulders of your own will, additional burdens besides what were long ago imposed on you by the Lord and the church; as you, by setting aside the custom of election to the bishoprics and other church dignities, and by taking away from all patrons the right of collation, have made the distribution of ecclesiastical offices, in all the grades, dependant on your will. Whether this was for your happiness, you must judge for yourself; but whether it serve for the well being of the church, is a question the discussion of which would occupy too much space for a letter." From these words it is easy to see—what accords with other declarations of Clemangis—that he, like the other men of the Paris University who favoured reform, considered some limitation of the papal power, which had brought everything within its vortex,—a limitation of this power in the guidance of the church, —as a thing calculated to promote the interest of the pope, by freeing him from responsibilities which he was in no condition to meet, as well as the good of the church itself. How important an object it seemed in his own mind, that the pope should be placed in contact with noble and free-hearted men, appears from the fact that he particularly recommended to him in this letter

Pierre d'Ailly, then chancellor of the University of Paris. He describes him as a man greatly distinguished by his knowledge, his character, and his zeal for the unity of the church; a man whose virtues had drawn upon him the hatred of many.[1] We will here mention, by the way, an incident characteristic of Clemangis and his relations to Avignon. He had sent this letter to his friends at the court in Avignon, requesting them to place it in the hands of the pope; but these friends had found it necessary to expunge many parts of it. The letter appeared to them too bold; they interpreted it as a want of respect, that he should address the pope in the singular number; the encomiums on Peter d'Ailly, whose free and noble spirit would not be likely to make him a favourite at the court of Avignon, they thought overdrawn, so they had taken the liberty to alter the letter according to their own will; for example to leave out the whole passage where Clemangis warns the pope against flattery, since even this seemed to them hardly consistent with the respect due to the pope. As a matter of course, the letter, as Clemangis complains, was robbed by these arbitrary omissions and alterations, of its true meaning. Now, had they presented the letter in this mutilated form, they might thus at least have shown their good intentions towards their friend; but by putting, as they did, the mutilated letter into the pope's hands along with the original, they may only have intended by such a course to shield themselves from any charge of disrespect towards the pope in transmitting to him so bold a letter, or they may, as Clemangis suspected, have intended to make the writer himself appear in an unfavourable light. At any rate they must have been much more intent on their own interest than on that of their friend. Clemangis bitterly blames this proceeding of his friends. "It is the pernicious distemper of these times"—he says—"and particularly of the place you live in, Avignon, to suppose that truth cannot please unless it appears decked out in ornaments and concealed by flattery; that if it be presented naked and with freedom, it must offend everybody and stir up against it anger or ridicule. No wonder then that you have contracted a taint from the customs of the place and the time."[2] At all events,

1 Ep. 2. Nic. de Clemangis opp. ed. Lydius, epp. pag. 6—10. 2 Ep. 3. pag. 12.

that solicitude of theirs was unfounded; and if they proposed to themselves any such object as those just mentioned, they were disappointed. Benedict could not have been displeased with Clemangis for speaking so freely. This honest freedom probably led him to entertain a still greater liking for the writer. Benedict succeeded in persuading Clemangis to enter into his own service, thereby gaining the double advantage of depriving the alliance of the more liberal parties at Paris of the talents of so good a man, and of turning these talents to the benefit of his own cause. Through the mediation of the friends of Clemangis at Avignon, the latter was induced to accept the office of papal secretary.

Doubtless the pope, who was observant of the change taking place in the culture of the times, wished to secure the better style of Clemangis which corresponded to the more refined taste now beginning to prevail, for his correspondence and public declarations; and the consideration which Clemangis offers as a reason why he could not be fitted for such an office, namely, that he could not alter his habit of writing into a common chancery style, may have been, in the view of the pope, an additional reason for wishing him to become his secretary. Hence, when Clemangis mentioned this difficulty, the pope simply requested him to retain the style to which he was accustomed. Clemangis, by personal inclination, had no particular fondness for the curial service, or the life at court. He had already declined many offers of the same kind, which had been held out to him by princes. He could not but have many objections therefore to make, at first, to this new proposal;—his habits of freedom, his disinclination to the court-life, his physical weakness and incapacity to endure any great degree of labour. But the pope bade his friends reply that he should lose none of his freedom, but rather obtain more than have less than he enjoyed before; that in the labours imposed on him due regard should ever be had to his ability and his inclination. So Clemangis determined to accept the place, and his further acquaintance with the court at Avignon, instead of producing any change in his feelings towards Benedict, seems rather to have confirmed him in his first good opinion of the pope, and in the friendly regards which he had for him. He says of the court at Avignon:

"While I would not say that it is free from all vices, I must still own that there was greater decency of behaviour, more dignity and self-respect in outward manners, than I have ever witnessed in the courts of secular princes." Certainly we must regard this as a singular statement, if we compare it with the picture which Petrarch in his letters has drawn of the court at Avignon; yet from the language of Clemangis himself, it may be gathered that the court at Avignon was not of the character which might be expected from the attendants on a pope. He speaks only by way of comparison; and thus much at least may be true, that Benedict was favourably distinguished in this respect from several of his predecessors, and endeavoured to give a corresponding dignity of manners[1] to his court.[2] In the next place, it is clear, from what Clemangis himself says respecting his relations at Avignon, that the pope, by the indulgence with which he treated him, took a strong hold on his affections and bound him to gratitude.[3] No labour was imposed on him, until he was first consulted whether it was agreeable to him; and if he had scruples about engaging in a matter of business, because it stood in some collision with his French interests, regard was had to these scruples.[4] Thus, with Clemangis, his personal regard for Benedict went with the opinion he had formed respecting the condition of the church, to determine his course of action under these circumstances. Let us listen to his own language. How profoundly he understood the corruption of the church in his times, we see from some remarks of his in a letter to a friend. He supposed that he witnessed in his times a greater depravation of manners than had existed in any pagan period, and that this could not be

1 Ep. 14, p. 57.

2 Also Theodoric of Niem, papal chamberlain at the Roman court, says of Benedict: Praeterea licet dictus Petrus de Luna gravitatem pontificalis officii et quid ageret ipso Bonifacio longe melius intelligeret. De schism. 2. c. 33.

3 Epist. 14. He boasts particularly of the care with which he was treated during a sickness at Avignon.

4 In the 42d letter he cites a case, where two cardinals had proposed to him in the name of the pope to draw up a writing in favour of a man who had been condemned by the parliament of Paris. He had urgently entreated that he might be let off from this, because he could do nothing to the prejudice of his king and country. One of the cardinals consented, but the other threatened him by saying, the pope would command it. "Well," said Clemangis, "I would prefer leaving the pope's service." From that moment not a word more was ever heard on the subject. P. 130.

so, if even but a dead faith, a *fides informis*, still existed. "Not love alone"—says he—"but the mere *fides informis* among us has become so withered, that the words of our Lord would fitly apply to our times: Shall I when I come, find faith on the earth?" He thinks that vice could not so unblushingly stalk abroad, if the doctrines of an eternal life, of future happiness and misery, of a future judgment, really found faith among men. "The articles of faith"—says he—"are accounted but fables." He thought, too, that in this dead faith might already be discerned a turning over to conscious infidelity.[1] What he says of the general state of things in France,[2] that the depravation of morals in that country was the fountain of all other evils, and that reconciliation with God must prepare the way for the restoration of civil peace, all this is, without doubt, to be applied also, as *he* means it, to the evils of the church of his time, and to the means for their cure. "What sort of good"—says he—"can we hope for, if we remain separated from the true source of all good. Out of what inferior stream can a blessing flow to us, if we are cut off from the fountain-head of all blessing?" Accordingly he declares that the great thing needed was reconciliation to God. And because *this* was the *great* need, everything else, which was undertaken with passionate party-zeal for the restoration of peace to the church, appeared to him vain. In a letter of later date addressed to Pope Benedict,[3] he says: "Not without some peril to myself have I written a great deal to you and others about the adjustment of this hateful schism; for I was careful to exhort all who engaged in this holy work, according to the measure of my knowledge, to see to it, that they set themselves about so great a matter, than which a greater has not been undertaken within the memory of man, in the right manner, with a pure heart, with disinterested zeal, with true charity, and with becoming modesty; not with arrogant pride, not with an overhasty confidence in the truth of their own opinions, not with selfish longings after temporal honour, or temporal advantage, not with zeal merely to accomplish their own objects, not with hatred nor ill-will towards any person whatever, not with suspicious jealousy, or persecution of those who think differently." He thought the

[1] Ep. 73, p. 210. [2] Ep. 77, p. 233. [3] Ep. 13, p. 51.

contrary of all this, then, might be seen in the doings of the several parties of his time, as he himself says: "All this, or most of what has mingled in the proceedings in the course which this affair has taken, disturbs it frightfully and ruins it altogether. By these means, the situation of things is not only rendered wholly unsuitable for the restoration of peace; but commotions still more violent, wounds still more severe, and the germs of new divisions are brought upon the church, which suffers grievously enough already from this wound; and unless the grace of the heavenly bridegroom interfere, she must plunge into the gulf of destruction." With this agrees also what he wrote to the king of France, when the renunciation of Pope Benedict had now lasted four years.[1] "You see what the refusal of obedience sought after with so much eagerness, has availed. It was said, respect and obedience to the pope was the chief obstacle in the way of restoring unity to the church; and if this were removed, peace would speedily ensue. This the whole body of the clergy asserted with the greatest vociferation. Behold, this obstacle has now been for four years removed, by subtraction of obedience to the pope; and still we perceive no signs of church union. Nay, the hopes formerly cherished have either wholly vanished, or at least their fulfilment is put off to an incalculable distance. It was promised, as a thing which would most certainly take place, that as soon as men heard of the subtraction by this kingdom, other states would immediately follow her example." "When this most inauspicious subtraction"[2]—says he—"had been extorted from you by these intrigues, messengers were sent out in all directions, either those who had themselves been concerned in bringing about the subtraction,[3] or those whom they pleased to select for this purpose." Every thing was done to spread the report of this proceeding far and wide, and to stir up others to imitation." "Behold"—he then adds—"who follows your example? All hold back, and not without good reason, from subtracting obedience to him whom they reverenced as Christ's vicegerent upon earth." It appears to him a great inconsistency, to refuse the obedience due to him who has been recognized as the legitimate pope. He notices it, again, as a remarkable fact,

1 Ep. 17, p. 63. 2 In faustissima obedientiae subtractio.
3 Ipsimet subtractionis artifices.

that the other princes, instead of being induced to follow the example of France, had rather attached themselves with a more persevering devotion to the acknowledged pope. He says, in particular of the other party: "They are excessively elated against us, ever since they heard that we are so divided amongst ourselves about our own pope; and they are expecting no other result from these quarrels among ourselves, than that, after we have deserted our pope, theirs will obtain the victory." He complains in this letter of the harsh treatment of the pope in keeping him closely shut up in his castle. He complains that nothing more was now done for the restoration of unity, but men were only on the anxious look out to defeat any attempt to effect a reconciliation with the pope; that no one was allowed to visit him, without first undergoing a thorough search to see that he carried no letters. Now, since it was manifest that the renunciation of the pope did not in the least contribute to the restoration of peace to the church, while they still persisted, however, in venting their rage on him, it might be seen, that under the pretext of seeking the peace of the church, their real object had been, from the beginning, enmity to the pope's person. He defended the pope's conduct, and maintained that from the first he had declared himself ready to enter into conference with his antagonist, the first step necessary to any agreement; and to adopt any other means, which could lead to the restoration of church unity; that he had in fact three years before declared himself willing to abdicate.[1] "Of what use was it," he said, "to think of forcing the pope to abdicate, when it meant nothing except as a free act." It was presupposed, therefore, that the pope should first be restored to liberty. He held that the most necessary thing, after restoring the pope to liberty, was the restoration of unity in their own party; then they should endeavour to unite on some measures to be taken in common with the other party. It was not by strife, by revilings, and the turmoil of the passions, that a restoration of church unity in any form was to be expected; but a negotiation for peace should be conducted in a peaceful and quiet way, and in a spirit of gentleness. All pains should be taken to pursue the object with a humble, sober distrust, each man of his own judgment, and not

1 Page 65.

with proud contempt of what others might think on the subject. "For the Lord often reveals his mysteries and his counsels, among which seem to belong also the restoration of unity to his church, to babes and sucklings, while he hides them from the wise and prudent, that no flesh may glory in his presence." In his letter to Pope Benedict XIII.,[2] where too he complains of the impure motives of men anxious only to have their own opinion prevail with regard to the best way of restoring the peace of the church, he expresses his surprise that learned theologians—men of the church, could consent to abandon everything to the arbitrary will of the secular power; he foresees the mischievous consequences which must result from such a course. The experiences to which Clemangis adverts, had influence also on others who had expected more than he had ever done from that renunciation of the pope; and now, when Benedict, set at large from his closely invested castle by the aid of an Arragonese nobleman, re-opened on a more free footing the negotiations with France, it was more easy to come to an agreement; and, in the year 1404, a partial return took place of the Gallic Church to the obedience of the pope, the latter having pledged himself to resign the papal dignity under the three following contingencies, that the other pope died, that he voluntarily resigned, or that he was deposed.

When in the year 1406, pope Innocent VII. died at Rome, the cardinals of that party were full of zeal to bring the church back to unity. Among the people there was but *one* wish, which could not longer be resisted. They were weary of the long-continued artful tricks, by which the popes of the two parties had contrived to keep up the schism. The question now arose among the cardinals whether they ought not to abstain from a new election, and unite with the other party at Avignon, for the purpose of choosing a pope who should be universally acknowledged, inasmuch as Benedict had been compelled to agree that in case of the death of his antagonist in Rome, he also would immediately abdicate. Thus an end would be put to the schism at once. It could not but be very evident to all, that it was only by declining to investigate the claims of the two parties, that any union was possible. Thus wrote the well-known Leonardo

1 Epist. 13. p. 51.

Bruno of Arezzo (Aretin), famous as one of the restorers of ancient literature, and at this time secretary to the papal court at Rome, in a report which he drew up relating to the events at that time in Rome. "We can expect no end to the division, as long as men are disposed to quarrel about their rights, especially as this matter has no judge but God himself."[1] Among the cardinals there was much contention on the point; and they would have resolved to abstain from the new election, had they not been afraid that they should give up something to the claims of the other party, or had they not felt a certain mistrust, not altogether unfounded, in the sincerity of Pope Benedict. Accordingly the resolution prevailed that they should proceed to a new election, but that each of the cardinals should bind himself by oath, in a more solemn manner than before, that in case of his election to the papal dignity, he would employ it singly for the purpose of healing the schism; that he would use every effort to effect a union for the promotion of this object with the other pope, and abdicate as soon as the latter would do likewise. Each cardinal pledged himself moreover that in case he should be elected pope, he would undertake to do nothing except what was required for that end, would nominate no new cardinals except when this was necessary in order that the number of the cardinals belonging to this party might be equal to that of the other. Since the cardinals then regarded the present election as only a provisional one, only a means to prepare the way for electing a pope who should be recognized as such by all, and for the utter extirpation of the schism, they directed their attention in choosing a candidate, not so much to any question about his other gifts and qualifications, as to the point of gaining in him a man free from ambition and the love of power, and full of zeal for the welfare and concord of the church. Great zeal for these objects had been manifested thus far by Cardinal Angelo Coravio of Venice, a man celebrated for his habits of austere devotion; and as he was eighty years old, it was the less to be expected that standing on the verge of the grave he would sacrifice the good of the church to the gratification of his ambition for a few brief mo-

1 Neque enim finem ullum inveterati schismatis sperare licebat, si de jure disceptaretur; praesertim cum praeter deum ea causa judicem nullum haberet. Leon. Bruni Aretini epp. 1, 2, 3. Hamb. 1724. 8vo.

ments. He called himself Gregory XII. After his accession to office he repeated the same assurances, which he had already expressed as a cardinal. What expectations were formed of him, may be seen from the following words of Aretin written about this time, who describes him as a man of antique severity and holiness. "He talks of the unity of the church"—says Aretin—"after this style; that if there were no other way, he would go on foot, staff in hand, to bring it about. We must look to his *actions;* and certainly there is good hope, on account of the singular integrity of the man. More than this, we find on the question of union, such an agreement of feeling among all, and the expectations of all so intensely raised, that if he were disposed to delay, they would in no wise permit it."[1] It is plain from these words of Aretin, that however strong the reasons might seem to be for trusting Gregory, still the disappointments which had been so often experienced created a feeling of uncertainty.

According to another eye-witness, the pontifical chamberlain, Theodoric of Niem, a German, the pope professed to his confidential friends, that it should be no fault of his, if the union were not brought about, in some place or other, even though it should be far from Rome. If he could not have galleys, he was ready to set sail in a small skiff; or if the way were better by land, and he had no carriage and horses, he would not be kept back by that, but plod his way on foot, staff in hand.[2] When Gregory held the first assembly of his cardinals, he still expressed openly the same zeal for the restoration of peace to the church. Some months after, on being requested to bestow certain benefices, he declined, observing that he had not been chosen pope *for that*, but simply to put an end to the schism; and so great was the longing after this, that the people of the Roman court, whose interests were touched by such a repulsive answer, still rejoiced at it, because they regarded it as a sure pledge that the pope was in earnest about that which was so often on his lips. In making known his resolution by embassies to all the princes, he entered with great zeal into negotiations also with Pope Benedict, who was bound by his solemn promise; and still had to fear a powerful party of free-spirited men in France, particularly at the University of Paris. The envoys of Gregory con-

1 Ibid. p. 41.

2 Theodorici a Niem de schismate, l. 3, c. 6.

ferred with Benedict at Marseilles, where they mutually agreed that the city of Savona was the most eligible place, on account of its situation, for a meeting and conference between the two popes; and that they should both repair thither on Michaelmas or all Saints' day, 1407, for the purpose of abdicating in common. At Paris the delegates of Gregory, on returning with this agreement, were received with great demonstrations of joy. It seemed now that the long-desired end of the schism could not be far off. Gregory was extolled as an angel of peace. Only Benedict could not be trusted. When the contract, overladen with provisos, and drawn up by Benedict, was placed before Gregory, with a smile on his lips, he expressed surprise that so many stipulations had been thought necessary, of which not one was needed here, since everything was so honourably meant.[1] Perhaps Gregory, at the beginning, was really of the temper which he expressed; but of a truth that temper was soon changed, and what may at first have been so honourably meant, was afterwards but the language of disguise and hypocrisy. Gregory's numerous relations came together in Rome; and there they endeavoured to turn his papal dignity to their own private advantage. They worked upon Gregory, till they made him alter his mind, and consent to sacrifice the good of the church to the interests of the nephews whom he ought to provide for. Already in April, 1407, Aretin wrote: "Some friends and kinsmen of the pope, who flocked around him upon his coming to the throne, have begotten in many the suspicion, that they are endeavouring to bend his hitherto upright will."[2] In addition to this came the political movements of King Ladislaus of Naples, who, in opposition to French interests, was endeavouring to obtain for himself the crown of Sicily, against the pretensions of Prince Louis of Angers, and wished to secure Gregory as an ally, having reason to fear a pope favourable to the interests of France. He must do everything, therefore, to prevent Gregory from resigning his post. In June, the pope appeared before the cardinals and other dignitaries, and openly avowed his purpose, hitherto only to be conjectured from occasional signs; for, although he had agreed with his rival, that they should both join in a common abdication at Savona, yet he was now only

1 L. 3, c. 13.

2 Aretini epp. 1, 2, 6.

looking round for some way of escape. He declared that he had no means for making the journey by land, and that he could not venture to go by sea on board the ships of the Genoese, on account of the hostilities between the Genoese and the Venetians; that he must by all means have Venetian galleys, but he could not obtain them to proceed so far as that port. The cardinals being very much dissatisfied with the pope, and proceeding to urge upon him the fulfilment of his agreement, he caused his difficulties to be laid before twenty-four eminent jurists, in the expectation that his known wishes would determine them to pronounce him free from the obligation. But he found himself mistaken. Still he could not even then be induced to alter his intentions. He pretended that those jurists had been influenced by their regard for the cardinals, to decide contrary to the truth.[1]

During these transactions, an event took place, which seemed calculated to deliver the pope from his embarrassment, and furnish him with a good reason for not keeping his word. King Ladislaus of Naples, in combination with the Colonna party in Rome, accompanied by the malcontents from the city, was approaching with a hostile force. Aretin says, that the pope declared at first that all reports about this had been got up by malicious persons; but the opponents of the pope perceived, when the truth turned out to be like the report, that what he had said was a mere pretence, and accused him of a secret understanding with that ally. The unexpected attack made by these troops at midnight excited in Rome the utmost alarm and confusion. The pope took refuge in the castle of St Angelo. The stratagem, however, was defeated. The Romans succeeded in expelling the enemy from the city. After this incident, Aretin wrote: "Many believe that this thing was purposely arranged by the pope, in order that the whole business of uniting the church might fall through, which would have been the issue had the king been successful. We by no means believe this of *the pope*, but we have no doubt of the guilt of *his kinsmen*."[2] The honest, free-spirited German historian, Theodoric of Niem, also an eye-witness, looks upon the whole as a plot of Gregory, hatched up to defeat the negotiations for peace. Speaking of

1 Theod. a Niem, l. 3, c. 17. Aretin, epp. l. 2, 7.

the pope's flight to the castle of St Angelo, he says: "This he did from design, and with the intent that if the enemy got the upper hand, and proceeded to besiege him in that castle, he might have it to plead as an excuse for his non-appearance at the first and second terms that he was deprived of his liberty."

And he concludes his account of the results brought about by the understanding which, as he supposes, existed between the two allies, who were bound together by a common political interest, with the beautiful words so often verified in history with regard to events by which great and important changes are supposed to be prepared: "But man's craft avails nothing in opposition to the divine counsels."[1]

In proportion as the crafty pope Benedict found that his rival had no serious intention of fulfilling the agreement, in the same proportion he manifested the utmost readiness to fulfil it faithfully on his part, as he could plainly foresee, that nothing would come of it, and he now had it in his power to throw the whole blame on Gregory. At the first appointed time he came to Savona. But Gregory travelled slowly; first to Viterbo. Then, in September, he came to Siena; but instead of getting to Savona, either at the first or the second term, he remained at Siena from September to January. He had great skill in inventing reasons for not complying with the invitations of the cardinals, and of the envoys coming to him from all directions for the purpose of urging him to end the schism. There was no route which for him would be a safe one. He got up processions to implore divine grace for the promotion of the peace of the church; granted indulgences to such as took part in them; sent letters of indulgence to those in all the countries that acknowledged him, who by their intercessions helped on the restoration of peace to the church, hoping thus to deceive the multitude. The Franciscans, who were his friends, found it necessary at mass to justify the procrastination of the pope in their sermons, and to tell the people that he could not make the journey to Savona without exposing himself and the cardinals to danger. Finally the pope arrived at Lucca. From this place Aretin wrote a letter relating to the negotiations for peace: "After we

[1] Sed contra divinam ordinationem astutia non suffragatur humana. L. 3, c. 18, fin.

had arrived at Lucca, numerous messengers passed to and fro; but nothing is as yet accomplished, nor has a single step been taken which seems to me calculated to inspire the least hope. In the other pope there is no honesty of purpose whatsoever; though he disguises his motives with wonderful adroitness, so as to deceive the unwary. But believe me, there is nothing sound about him; for if there were, what is there to prevent the object from being accomplished? For if either one of the two were really willing to do what he has sworn to do, the other would be obliged to fulfil his part whether willing or not willing. For what excuse or evasion could he have? But now when both delay, one furnishes the other with means of evasion and excuse. Our pope is of a straightforward, simple nature; but a good and simple man is easily deceived by dishonest knaves. For some who are hoping to obtain honourable posts from him have contrived to get hold of him by flattery. These fill his mind with idle fears, and often bring him round again when he intends to do what is right. As the present tone of feeling is, I apprehend trouble; for more acrimony of hatred, more violent indignation could not exist."[1] We see from these words, dictated by the immediate impression of the moment, the high state of excitement produced among the attendants on the pope at Lucca, by these under-handed arts, and the fears that were entertained that some violent outbreak would give vent to the suppressed feelings of indignation. And so it happened, that in the middle of the fasts a Carmelite, preaching before the pope, the cardinals and the foreign envoys assembled here on the business of the union, felt impelled, turning round to the pope, to exhort him urgently that he would spare no effort to hasten the union, reminding him of the assurances which he had so repeatedly given. Two nephews of the pope, who had great influence with him, were so exasperated at this, that they caused the preacher to be dragged out of the church and cast into prison, where he languished for many days, and a worse fate would have befallen him had not powerful friends interposed in his behalf. He was forbidden to preach any more; and Gregory, to secure himself for the future against being disturbed by such honest admonitions, ordered that no person should thereafter be allowed to preach before him,

[1] Aretin. epp. 1, 2, 10.

unless his discourse had first been examined by some one of his immediate attendants.[1] The pope was in no want of men, such as his nephews, whose selfish interests would naturally prompt them to confirm him in his designs against the union. Among these, belonged in particular, one of those individuals whose lives afford the most striking testimony to the monstrous corruption of the church of this time,—a Franciscan who, sunk in crime, had been led by some outward occasion or other, in the later years of his manhood, to become a monk, and whom King Ladislaus employed on his political errands, and called his father confessor. Through him, the king had carried on his negotiations with pope Gregory, and the latter always kept him near his person. Theodoric of Niem relates, that a citizen of Lucca with whom this Franciscan resided while the pope was stopping at that city, told him he never met anywhere with so bad a man, nor would he suffer him to remain in his house, were he not compelled to do so by fear of the governing authorities in Lucca.[2] The two popes approached a few steps nearer together; for when Gregory arrived at Lucca, Benedict advanced to Porto Venere. And yet it seemed as if they were never to meet. In vain, negotiations were entered into respecting a place of interview, with which both parties could be satisfied. None was to be found safe enough for both. Gregory feared the hostile power at sea; and dared not approach too near the coast. Benedict could not venture too far from the coast, as he stood in fear of ambuscades by land. Aretin, an eye-witness of these evasive tricks, writes: "Thus, one of the popes, like a marine animal, was afraid to trust himself on dry land, the other, like a land animal, shuddered at sight of the waves."[3] But what added to the vexation was this, that according to the common belief there was no danger, either to the one if he ventured on dry land, nor to the other if he visited the coast. And it was the general opinion, that they both clearly understood the same thing, but hypocritically pretended fear, for the purpose of cheating men out of their earnest expectations. Hence there were loud com-

1 Theod. a Niem de schism. lib. 3, c. 25.

2 Theod. a Niem de schism. lib. 3, c. 15.

3 Ita alter quasi aquaticum animal in siccum exire, alter quasi terrestre undas aspicere perhorrebat. Aretini epp. lib. 2, 13.

plaints, and men began already to speak openly against these proceedings. All were filled with indignation, that persons of their age, for both were past seventy, for the sake of sitting a few years in the papal chair, should put themselves beyond all fear of God and the judgment of mankind. Aretin takes notice of the impression which this conduct of the two popes produced on the general mind. "What"—says he—"could happen to us more shameful and more dishonourable than that the two parties, after having shortly before voluntarily fixed upon a place for the restoration of union among Christians, should immediately thereupon, when the expectations of all were intensely raised, show an unwillingness to come to the spot? Some one may say, dost thou venture to write this, when thou belongest among the pope's confidants? Yes. The case is so; for why should I now flatter him, and feign as if I thought otherwise: for I am one of the Christians and one of the Italians. It grieves me that the former should be defrauded of the union and of peace, and the latter accused of being faithless and promise-breakers."[1]

Gregory at length gave it to be understood, that he no longer had any thoughts of joining with his rival in a common abdication. He made trial of other arts. He put forth on the sixth of July the proclamation for a general council, whose place of assembling he would more distinctly announce. As a reason for this he alleged the experience which had been gained, that a common abdication was a thing impracticable; the council, however, included in itself all other means of restoring church concord. At the same time he asserted, in defiance of the freer tendencies now springing up, that it belonged to the pope alone to convoke a general council; that one assembled without his permission was but a *conciliabulum*, and should be considered as altogether destitute of authority.[2] This council was at a later period actually assembled at Aquileia, but could do nothing more than play an insignificant farce. The cardinals were not inclined to let themselves be mocked any longer by the pope; to share the disgrace and the exasperated feeling which he must necessarily encounter. Matters were coming to an open contest between them and the pope. Gregory, unmindful of the oath which he had taken, was desirous of appointing four new cardi-

1 L. c. 2 Theodoric a Niem de schism. lib. 3, c. 36.

nals, partly for the purpose of promoting his nephews and favourites, partly that he might procure for himself, in these creatures, some support against the older cardinals; but the latter manifested violent opposition and declined to acknowledge, as their colleagues, the persons who, in spite of them, were nominated by the pope. As they had the worst to fear from the obstinate pope, and wished to act with more freedom in some other place, where they could be safer, they fled to Pisa.[1]

As to Pope Benedict, he was made more haughty by the weakness of his rival. But he could meet with as little success as the latter in carrying out his designs. He had to sustain a still severer contest with the more liberal spirit in France. The king sent him a letter, threatening, that unless the pope came to some agreement with his opponent to restore concord to the church by the festival of Ascension of the following year, France would again renounce him and declare herself neutral. Benedict replied to this by a series of violent steps. He issued a bull threatening the ban and the interdict. This was publicly torn in pieces, and the pope, at an assembly of the University of Paris, was declared a schismatic and heretic. Proceedings were set on foot against those who had taken part in the drawing up and publication of that bull; and suspected individuals were violently persecuted. Among these was Clemangis, who continued, it is true, to be a friend of Benedict and dissatisfied with violent measures, as also Gerson was, but who could appeal to the fact that he knew nothing at all about the steps of Benedict, and also that the bull bore internal evidence of being contrary to his style.[2] The Gallic church separated itself entirely from the pope. Orders were given to the French governor at Genoa to take possession of Benedict's person; but he succeeded in making his escape to his native country, Arragon; where he played off a similar farce with Gregory, in the convocation of a pretended general council. Eight cardinals of his party repaired to Pisa; and all who were there assembled, now joined in putting forth a proclamation for a *general council* in the year 1409, which should put an end to the schism and bring about a reformation of the church in its head and members, and whose place of meeting should be at Pisa.

1 See the account of this affair in Aretin's report, epp. lib. 2, 13.

2 Clemang. ep. 42. p. 129.

Upon this council the eyes of all who had at heart the well-being of the church in western Christendom were directed. Two great problems were to be worked out by that council, of which one could not be worked out without the other; the long and earnestly desired restoration of concord, and the long and earnestly desired reform of a church corrupted and stained with sin in all its parts, and deeply sunk in worldliness. Everything depended at first on the question, whether the council would proceed with clear consciousness, on the principles of a freer system of ecclesiastical law. It should be conscious that itself constituted the highest representation of the church, since it was called to pass judgment even upon popes; otherwise it must succumb to their policy, and fail as all previous attempts to do away the schism had failed. But then it was very difficult for the cardinals to emancipate themselves at once from a system of church government, which had obtained for a long series of centuries, which was interwoven into all parts of the church administration, and which upheld itself by its own consistency. It was a contest between an old period and a new one which must break path-way for itself. The men who, with the full consciousness of knowledge, expressed and defended the spirit of the new period, thus exerting an influence on the formation of a new public opinion, had the great merit of preparing the way for a happy issue of the council of Pisa. In this, the University of Paris took the most important place; and the principal leader of the movement in this university was chancellor Gerson; a man whose influence, both as a writer and a speaker, was pre-eminently great. Let us first cast a glance, then, at the principles of reform diffused abroad by this writer prior to the commencement of the council of Pisa.

The system of the church Theocracy, such as we have seen evolving itself from the times of the third century, was here by no means abandoned; but it was to be purified from the heterogeneous elements, which in the course of the middle ages had become mixed up with it, or which had proceeded from the development of the principle once expressed and steadily carried out to its extreme consequences, and to be reduced back again to its original foundation before the middle ages. The externalized conception of the church, as of an organic whole, to be traced

up through the succession of bishops and the representation of church unity in the Roman church as cathedra Petri to a divine origin, was held fast as one and identical with the essence of christianity itself. But the conception of this *one universal church* was placed foremost, as the original and highest idea; and the authority of a single head of the church governance was made subordinate to this highest spiritual power, and very much lowered. Papal absolutism was to be overturned; the universal church to recover her rights, the authority of single bishops, and the independence of single national churches to be restored. Its independent authority was to be secured to the sovereignty of the state. The state was to be emancipated from the tutelage of church Theocracy, which had swallowed up all authority into itself. They were essentially the same principles as those which had already, when the Pseudo-Isidorean decretals first began to claim validity, sent forth from France an influence to counteract the rising power of the popes. Gerson took his departure from a conception of the church and of its unity, which might have conducted him to a more profound and spiritual mode of apprehending the matter. The relation of the church to Christ, as its sole unconditionally necessary, invisible head, was that to which at first he gave the chief prominence. The essential unity of the church, as Christ's spiritual body, the *corpus mysticum*, reposed solely on union with him, the invisible Head, diffusing his life-giving influence through the whole. But he presently assumed, that the diffusion of this influence was conditioned on the organism of the external church governance founded by Christ himself, whereby the form was prescribed under which alone this spirit could at any time be active. Hence he considered the hierarchy in all its gradations, as a thing immutable, necessary for all times, and so the presence of a visible, ministerial and accidental chief at the head of the church government, appeared to him to be also necessary. Still he supposes that, inasmuch as the church when the papacy is vacant again produces such a head from herself, and inasmuch as she can in certain moments subsist under the guidance of the one invisible head, without that visible head, so also she has power to pass judgment on popes, to displace them, and may continue to subsist for a time under the guidance of a general council of

bishops, which represents her, without such a visible head, although the latter as a general thing is necessary to her organism; and she must ever reproduce such a head from herself. In the case of the exercise of that supreme guidance of the church by the popes, we should distinguish what is essential from what is unessential, what is mutable from what is immutable, what is founded in divine right from what is founded in the letter of a positive law. As the good of the whole is the highest law, and it is only for that the power of the pope subsists, that power may be modified and limited by a general council, as the general good may require at any time. Hence the assembling of a general council is not a thing necessarily dependant on the pope alone. In a tract composed at some time prior to the council of Pisa,[1] in which he unfolds these principles, he says: "It is from Christ, the Head and bridegroom of the church, the mystical body which is the church, has her origin; and directly from him she has her power and her authority, so that she may, for the purpose of preserving her unity, cause the assembling, in a regular manner, of a general council, which represents her. This is evident from the words of Christ: Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them; where, it is to be carefully observed, that he does not say in the name of Peter or of Paul, but in *my* name, thus intimating that wherever the faithful do but assemble, if this be done in *his* name, *i.e.*, in faith on Christ and for the weal of his church, he himself stands by them as an infallible guide."[2] He proves this, again, from the universal law of nature; for every natural body exerts a natural reaction against whatever threatens to destroy or dissolve it, and if it is an animated body, it combines by a natural necessity all its members and powers for the preservation of its unity and to repel whatever threatens to disintegrate it; and the same holds good of every civil body politic. Accordingly the spiritual body of the church, as the best ordered, may use a similar right for the preservation of its unity and the working off of every schismatic division, as

1 Propositiones, utiles ad exterminationem praesentis schismatis per viam concilii generalis. Io. Gersonis opp. ed. Du Pin. Antw. 1706, tom. ii. p. 112, 113.

2 Propositiones, p. 112: Dans intelligere, quod ubicunque congregantur fideles, cum hoc fiat in nomine suo, hoc est in Christi fide, et pro ecclesiae suas salute, ipse assistit eis tanquam director et infallibilis rector.

a thing whereby the original order is disturbed. At a later period, for justifiable reasons, this power of the church was so limited, that no council could be assembled without the authority of the pope. This was done for the purpose of doing honour to the apostolical chair, and of counteracting those heretics and schismatics, who sometimes endeavoured, according to their own caprice, and by the power of secular princes, to convoke councils who would countenance and uphold their errors. But by this modification in conformity to the necessities of the times, the fact was not altered, that this power, in itself considered, ever resides in the church; for that cannot be annulled by the letter of any positive law, which has its foundation in a natural and divine right; and the church therefore may, in certain cases, convoke a council without the authority of the pope; for a custom which has been introduced for the good of the church ought not to be observed to the prejudice or great peril of the same. He instances the three following cases in particular: 1, if during a vacancy of the apostolic chair, a *heresy* or another *persecution* of the church breaks out, which must be counteracted by a council; 2, if in such a case of necessity, or where the manifest interest of the church demands a council, the pope should become insane or fall into heresy, or in any other way should be unfitted for his duty, or should neglect it when invited to do it; or, thirdly, if several individuals present rival claims to the papal dignity, so that the whole church obeys neither of them, and each separately refuses to appear at the summons of one or of both together, as the case seemed to be at the present time. Gerson, in maintaining the necessity only of that one organism in the church which was to be traced to a divine origin, recognized the changes resulting from the necessities of each period in all other relations of the church; as, for example, in its relations to the state and to worldly goods; and he moreover ascribed to the church of *his own* time, in its collective capacity, the right and the duty of undertaking such changes as the wellbeing of the church might peremptorily require. Here there ought to be no binding law; but the letter of every law must be subservient to the highest law, the weal of the church; human right must be subordinated to the divine. On these principles, Gerson proceeded from the first amid all the negotiations relating to the doing away of the schism, only leaning

to different sides according as he thought he saw danger coming either from *positivism* pushed to an extreme, or from what appeared to him to be a revolutionary tendency plunging headlong into violent and radical measures.

Again, the merit of Gerson consisted in this, that he directed attention to the fact that the inward corruption of the church being the source of all other evil and also of the schism, no thorough and lasting cure of the church could take place without reformation; and that it ought therefore to be a main business of the council to effect this. And he himself points out in his writings and discourses on reform, several particular branches of ecclesiastical corruption in this period which called for correction. From what he says on this subject, we are enabled to understand the very low condition to which the church had fallen. He invites the bishops to a more exact performance of church visitations. In making these, they should inform themselves of the character of the parish priests, find out whether they were familiar with the liturgical form of baptism, of the consecration of the Holy Supper, etc.; because there were many who did not understand these things; and it was plain, what great scandal and what danger grew out of it; for unless God mercifully completed what was defective, they could neither baptize nor bestow absolution; and if they were familiar with these forms, yet they pronounced them in so hasty and inappropriate a manner, that the whole rite was violated thereby. Then they should inquire, whether those priests could repeat the sins, and the articles of faith, and whatever else they ought to know in order to impart, at least, the most general instruction to the communities. It was so little thought possible to preserve strictness in the observance of the laws of priestly celibacy, that Gerson seriously proposed it as a question worthy of mature consideration, whether priests living in concubinage must not be tolerated, as were the public prostitutes, to avoid a worse evil, which might arise if they were compelled to separate from their concubines; now that the number of those living in concubinage had become so great. Against such, the penalty of excommunication was not to be employed, because it could not be carried into effect. If the holy men of ancient times observed an opposite course, yet they had never seen the evil so deep-rooted as it

had now become; and how impossible was it to apply at the present time the ancient severity of church discipline. He asks for the abrogation of ecclesiastical laws of excommunication, which could no longer be enforced; and which, so long as they continued to exist in letter, served only to disquiet the conscience. He objects to the too light use of excommunication whereby incredible injury was done to souls, and at length contempt of all divine laws superinduced. It should be attempted to find out to what use penance money could be applied; to ascertain where other ecclesiastical penalties would be more salutary according to the kind and magnitude of the sins committed, and whether the turning of those fines, not to pious objects, but to private emolument, did not give occasion for murmuring. When all this and the like had been inquired into, the theologian who accompanied the bishop in his visitations should preach a sermon adapted to the general intelligence of the laity, avoiding curious questions, and touching only upon such matters as might serve for the improvement of manners and for edification; moreover the sermon should remind the hearers of the general ground-work of the faith. How ridicule of the saints might keep company with superstition, was shown in that *fastum fatuorum*, a service set up for sport by the clergy themselves, on the festival of the innocents, the festival of the circumcision of Christ, that of Epiphany, and on the fast days. This abuse had crept in to such an extent that Gerson proposed it as a serious question, in what way that most ungodly and foolish custom, which prevailed throughout France, could be abolished or at least moderated. Finally, he directs attention to the necessity of taking pains for the improvement of the schools, holding that it was from the children the reformation of the church must begin—a remark often on his lips.[1]

When the council of Pisa was about to be opened, Gerson addressed to it his Essay on the Unity of the Church,[2] which he thus begins; "To those who are about to occupy themselves with the re-establishment of concord in the church, one of those who are zealous for this peace of the church wishes them all success in finding a way to this end! And though he is himself chained

1 Rememoratio, ibid. p. 109: A pueris videtur incipienda ecclesiae reformatio.
2 De unitate ecclesiae. Ibid. p. 113.

and confined at home by necessary business, so that he cannot attend the council, yet the word of the Lord is not bound." He defends the authority of the council first against objections growing out of the letter of the positive law that a council could not be held without the authority of the pope; that a person deprived of the papal authority must first obtain his dignity over again; that those who had renounced obedience to the pope, must be rejected as enemies; that no man can call the pope to account; particularly if he has not erred expressly against the articles of faith, as he could be sentenced by no man, and was subject to no one, and could not be a schismatic; that it was dangerous for the pastor to leave his flock as he must do if he abdicated; that each of the popes had done his utmost for the purification of the church, and was therefore free from fault; that it was necessary to inquire on which side lay the right and the truth, as without this knowledge those who had erred could not come to repentance. Against these, he sets up the following principles. As the schism of the church had grown out of a breach with God occasioned by sin, so the correction of bad manners could be brought about only by reconciliation with God, the unity of the church only by humility before God, and prayer. How otherwise could men hope for a removal of the schism, if the cause continued to operate, unless it were done by the free grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is wont to bestow great blessings even on the undeserving and unthankful? "But still" —he adds—"we must be co-workers with him, especially at this moment when the enemy of peace is furious because the return of peace seems nearer." He hints by way of warning, that this enemy would introduce the greatest hindrances for the purpose of prolonging the schism, sowing discord among those who were to labour for the unity of the church, by working upon their pride, or exciting covetousness or envy. He asserts that the church, by divine and natural right, with which no correctly understood positive right could be at variance, may, for the purpose of creating for herself one certain vicegerent of Christ, meet together in a general council representing herself; and this not by the authority of the cardinals alone, but also by the aid of any prince, or other christian. Human ordinances ought to serve only for the edification, not for the destruction of the

church. The council, for the purpose of bringing about that outward union, should proceed so that a safe conduct should first of all be given by the princes and others to both individuals contending for the papal dignity, in case they were willing to appear before the council to fulfil their oaths. But if they had no confidence in such a guaranty, the abdication should be required of them by delegates lawfully invested with full powers to demand it. If they both refused, the council should then proceed, without regard to them, to the election of a universally acknowledged pope. If some, however, should remain obstinately devoted to one of the two popes, and would not follow the judgment of the council, a thing hardly to be supposed, then they must see to it each for himself, how this would stand with their own salvation; the council and its adherents were free from all responsibility about the schism. If the reformation of the church in its head and its members, without which no thorough eradication of the schism could be effected, should be carried through at the council, still the utmost zeal would be called for, and must be perseveringly employed, lest, by a just judgment of God, some worse evil might ensue, if after the restoration of unity, the church fell back again into the old corruption.

Gerson affirmed that there could be no positive law, which was capable of being applied to the infinite variety of cases that might occur. All positive laws corresponded to the necessities of particular times; and the unity of the church could not now be restored unless men looked rather at the spirit than at the letter of the law, and expounded it according to the eternal laws of divine justice.[1]

The council of Pisa proceeded in strict conformity to the principles of the University of Paris, which were every day more widely diffused, and on which too the existence and authority of a council assembled without the pope, and making itself judge over him, altogether depended. In the midst of the transactions during the thirteenth session, appeared an eminent theologian, Master Plaul, who set forth and expounded the principles of the supreme authority of general councils, in a way that commanded universal acquiescence.[2] The council was opened by the cardinal Peter Philargi, archbishop of Milan, afterwards nominated pope,

1 Quatuor considerationes. P. 119 A. 2 H. v. d. Hardt. tom. ii p. 132.

with a discourse, in which he impressively described the mischiefs which had arisen from the contest between the two popes. He said: "You know how those two wretched men calumniate one another and disgrace themselves by invectives full of rant and fury. Each calls the other antipope, obtruder, antichrist." What violence was done by such language to christian feeling; how was right turned into wrong! "For"—says he—"each of them to gain patrons in the world, to make his own party stronger by this or that person, dares not give a repulse to anybody that asks for anything. The man whom one rightly condemns, the other pronounces not bound. And thus all order is turned to confusion."[1] From the evils of the mischievous schism which he pourtrays, he argues the necessity of the assembling of a general council, from which alone the cure was to be expected. Not one of the more ancient councils—he declared—had ever been brought together by causes more urgent. When, after the third citation, no delegate from the two popes appeared in their defence, they were condemned, first as contumacious, (in contumaciam.) Next, the council declared, in its ninth session, that since Gregory and Benedict had been unfaithful to the oaths they had taken on the matter of abdicating for the good of the church, all might rightfully refuse to pay them ecclesiastical obedience. Then in the fifteenth session they were declared schismatics and heretics, and deposed from all their ecclesiastical dignities. All of whatever rank, even kings and emperors, were absolved from the oath of obedience given to these popes, and it was forbidden on penalty of the ban to recognize them henceforth as popes, and to obey them as such; the papal chair should from that moment be considered as vacant. To the protest of the emperor Rupert, who was devoted to the cause of Gregory, no regard whatever was paid. When, after the eighteenth session, the delegates of Pope Benedict XIII., escorted by an envoy from the king of Arragon, who was an adherent of Benedict, appeared, they were received with loud and violent outcries. One protocol reports,[2] "a cry rose against them as if they were Jews." When one of the delegates, the archbishop of Taraco, named him as pope, he was interrupted with loud shouts, and the delegates afterwards retired

1 P. 98. 2 Sessio specialis, p. 142.

without accomplishing anything. The council had now, as they supposed, resolved one of the problems. By deposing the two popes they had put an end to the schism: so that nothing stood any longer in the way of the election of a universally acknowledged pope. But, in truth, this was so only in appearance; for Gregory and Benedict had still their adherents; and if a new pope were to be chosen, he could the less reckon upon a universal acknowledgment, unless by what he did for the good of the church, he was wise enough to gain over the hearts of the rebellious. In this regard, the most important thing was the reformation of the church *in capite et membris*, which had so long been earnestly desired. That without this, a thorough extirpation of the schism was not to be thought of, had indeed been emphatically testified by such men as D'Ailly, Gerson, and Clemangis. In the sixteenth session, the cardinals pledged themselves, that whichever of them should be elected pope, would not break up the council until one of the necessities of the church, a satisfactory reformation *in capite et membris*, should be effected. The cardinals then proceeded to elect a pope, and the choice fell upon the cardinal Peter Philargi, archbishop of Milan. This person, then sixty years old, was born in Candia, while that island stood under the rule of the Venetians. He was of Greek descent. Having been early left an orphan, he was adopted when a boy by the Franciscans; and care was bestowed upon his education within the order. Thus he became himself a member of it. He had visited the most eminent universities, Oxford and Paris, and was esteemed as a man well-skilled in the scholastic theology of the day. The account given of him by the free-spirited Theodoric of Niem would not lead us to regard him exactly as a man of spiritual temper or life. He knew nothing else to say of him, except that he liked to enjoy life, and drank strong wine.[1] He called himself Alexander V. The Parisian Chancellor Gerson, who had been prevented from attending the earlier sessions of the council, still came in time after the completion of the pope's election, to preach a discourse before Alexander V., amid the assembled council, in which he confirmed the principles on which the council of Pisa had acted, and reminded the pope of his duties

1 De schism. l. 3, c. 51, p. 180: Libenter bene et laute vivebat, bibendo ut frequenter vina fortia, et delectabatur in illis.

to the church.[1] He took for his text Acts i. 6, and from the words of this passage proceeded to draw the contrast between the actual state of the church and what it should be, as representing the kingdom of God; and he invited the pope to engage with all zeal in the work of bringing the church to the realization of this idea. He certainly could not have known by what kind of movements this papal election had been brought about, nor could he have divined what was to be expected from an election which had been so brought about, when he praised all that had thus far been done by the council as a work of God. The church, he began, sighing under the evils of the schism, had cried out to the Lord: "When wilt thou restore again the kingdom in Israel?" and this prayer had in part been heard. "For"—says he—"from whom comes this your choice? Comes it not from Christ? Whence so wonderful a convocation of the council? Whence the unheard of agreement of men just before contending with each other? Whence so speedy an assemblage of so many bishops and learned men? Assuredly from God; who is not a God of confusion but of peace." He next defends the council, as a work of God, from objections made against its validity. "The pope had not convoked it; therefore it was but a conventicle. O ridiculous and unreasonable judgment." He adverts to the examples of assemblies occurring in the Acts of the Apostles, which had not been convoked by the Apostle Peter; the example of the general council of Nice, which had not been assembled by the Roman bishop Silvester, but by the Emperor Constantine; the example of the fifth ecumenical council, to the meeting of which, as he supposes, the bishops had mutually invited each other. "Were these, then, conventicles? Be very careful how you assert any such thing. And suppose now"—says he—"the division among Christians renders it uncertain which of the two rivals they should reverence as the pope? Suppose the pope, which is a very rare case, should fall into heresy?" He cites the example of Liberius, who had subscribed an Arian confession of faith, of Marcellinus, who is said to have offered to idols. Suppose one oppresses Christendom with intolerable burdens? Dost thou leave us any other remedy against so grievous distempers? I do

1 Gerson. sermo coram Alexandro, etc. Ibid. p. 131.

leave such an one, thou wilt say. I believe it, most assuredly; for thou wouldst attribute to the church-constitution too great imperfection, and not recognize it as one wholesomely established of God, whose works are all perfect, if it were capable of being attacked by a distemper to which no remedy could be applied. Yet in the cases mentioned no remedy is left, if the church could never come together unless convoked by the pope." He then represents the church as turning to the pope, and addressing him the invitation to restore the kingdom to Israel. He represents her as expressing the hopes he had inspired her with. He reminds the pope of the obligation to preach the gospel to all nations; speaks of the Saracens, of the people of India, who needed the restoration of pure doctrine, because they had been so long separated from the church of Rome. He next comes to speak of the Greeks, to whom he acknowledges that the Latins were greatly indebted; and thinks he may be the more brief on this point, inasmuch as he is speaking before one descended from this nation. He then invites the pope so to direct his efforts that the remains of the schism, the two popes still having their parties, might be destroyed, which could easily be brought about by his zeal and the activity of the princes united with him. He proceeds next to speak of the internal condition of the church. He speaks of the dissolution of ecclesiastical order occasioned by the papal exemptions; describes how the bishops had broke loose from the archbishops, and so again the subordinates of the bishops from their authority. He complains that the monks, who for the purpose of devoting their life exclusively to works of christian charity and to science, had voluntarily renounced all earthly possessions —the mendicants—were aspiring after the highest spiritual dignities; or if they could have no hope of obtaining them, after the inferior benefices. "It is singular, that none should be so eager to grow rich, as those whose vocation forbids them to be rich. For why do they incessantly besiege the ears of the pope, with the hope of extorting new benefices? Let them answer it to themselves, whether they have in view the common good, rather than to fill their own purses, to live in splendour, and bid adieu to the poverty which they have vowed. Albeit experience has taught me much, yet I will not judge." He complains that nearly all defied with the greatest vehemence the ecclesiastical laws, sometimes

asking for permission to unite offices which were incompatible with each other; sometimes to enjoy the revenues of benefices as absentees; sometimes to obtain high dignities before the maturity of years; sometimes not to be compelled to receive ordination, and a thousand other things forbidden by the laws. Was it not intolerable, that the great prelates should give up the flocks entrusted to them, as a prey to wolves, and daily busy themselves in the computation of princely finances, disregarding the commandment of the Apostle Paul, 2 Tim. ii. 4 ? He inveighs against those prelates who engaged in the trade of war, and from bishops turned into commanders of armies. What was more shameful than to see learned men of good manners, either deprived of ordination, and without any spiritual office, or occupying the lowest positions, while the unlearned and vicious rose to the highest places ; to see the former starving, and the latter besotted? He expresses his indignation, that where all strife should be banished afar, that there strife was sown broadcast. Scarcely was there a benefice bestowed, which the pope did not confer on *one* man, the legate on *another*, and the bishop on a *third*. And was it less absurd, that these benefices should be conferred more out of respect to human favour or fear, to impure desires, to relationship, or to some whim, than from judgment and selection ? To these abuses he traced all the divisions. Do they not strive "—he represents the church as saying—"much more how they may secure benefices by the laws of Justinian, than how they may teach the people the law of Christ? Do I say *teach?* nay, I should rather say *learn*. For what man of the whole number of priests canst thou point out to me, who is not unskilled in the law of Christ? Do they not labour much more after gain than to win souls?" He laments those extortions practised on the communities, for which unjust complaints served as a pretext. He complains of the concubinage, the open debaucheries of ecclesiastics. He represents the church as expressing the hope, that the pope, who from childhood had been bred up in the severe spiritual life, would call men like-minded with himself to the benefices, and hold unspiritual men at a distance. "If"—says he—"you do this, which the duty of the high calling you have undertaken necessitates, then, after the extirpation of all roots of schism, christian peace will again take possession of the world. The

depravation of manners was the first cause of the evil; therefore the reformation of manners will be the first cause of good." Then he comes to the immediate attendants on the pope, reminding him that he would not have it in his power to accomplish such a work without the concurrence of those who were stationed near him. He advises him to care less for minor things, and to expend all his zeal on the greatest and most important.

Before his coronation, the pope declared that he should occupy himself with the reformation of the church, as he and the rest of the cardinals had pledged themselves to do previous to the election. And he proposed that pious and learned men should be selected out of every nation, to labour at this task in connection with the cardinals.[1] In the twentieth session he confirmed all the measures that had been taken by the cardinals, since the time they had come together, for the union of the church, and all the decrees and ordinances of the council; and he was disposed to complete all that was still wanting, in a juridical and practical point of view, whenever and to whatever extent it might be necessary. He united the two parties among the cardinals, Roman and French, so that for the future they should form together one college. It is deserving of remark, that the pope thought it necessary to confirm the judgments and ordinances of the council, and to supply what was wanting in order to their validity,—a thing, however, which strictly taken conflicted with the recognition of the unconditional supreme authority of general councils, and by which at bottom the principles on which depended the validity of his own election, were unsettled. Neither was the earnestly desired reformation of the church brought about at this council; but the pope directed, in the twenty-second session, that after three years a general council should again assemble, at some place which should be designated a year beforehand.[2] And it was next ordered in the final session, the twenty-third, that "Whereas the pope had it in purpose, in connection with the council, to reform the church in its head and members; and whereas, by the grace of God, much has been actually set in order by him; and whereas, many other things, relating to the order of the prelates and other subordinate ecclesiastical persons still remained to be done, which, owing to the

1 See Hardt. tom. ii., p. 146. 2 P. 155.

premature departure of the prelates and delegates, could not be brought about, therefore, the transactions respecting the reformation should be suspended until the meeting of the above mentioned second council, and then and there continued." This next council was, therefore, to be a continuation of the council of Pisa.—Such was the termination of the council, from which men had expected at length the subdual of the schism, and the renovation of the church.

The most striking judgment on the course of proceedings at this council, and the causes why it so little answered the expectations which it had excited, is passed by Nicholas of Clemangis, the man best informed about the faults of his time. "What means[1] it to cry Peace, Peace, when there is no peace, except it be only to have regard for temporal peace and neglect spiritual, without which not even any true and certain temporal peace can be obtained? What else at the council of Pisa deceived the church of God and the people, and made them cry out Peace, Peace, when there was no peace? Was it not just this, that fleshly-minded men, filled with worldly desires, which get the upper hand wherever love grows cold, inflamed and quite blinded with the zeal of getting benefices, prevented the reformation of the church, which the majority of believers and of well-disposed men longed after beyond all things else; and immediately proceeded to a new election? And when this had been effected, and they had obtained the desired promotions, they cried out, It is peace. And after the council was dissolved, they returned home with the peace which they were after, that is, with their promotions." As an example to show the mischief which must inevitably arise, when a council imagine themselves following the suggestions of the Holy Ghost, without having first taken pains to make themselves susceptible of his guidance by a suitable temper, he cites this council of Pisa. "Those"—he says—"who attended the council of Pisa, decreed and published, that by a new election, which was hastily made in compliance with the wishes of a few ambitious men, they had removed schisms from the church and restored peace to her. And who in the church is so blind as not to understand clearly by experience, how much

1 Clemangis super mater. conc. gener., opp. p. 70.

they themselves and the whole church were deceived by that opinion? Nothing worse could have been done to the church, nothing more dangerous to union, than before every thing had been duly arranged, and placed on the basis of security and concord, so as to be able to treat of peace at all, to proceed to a new election,—the very thing which from the beginning had laid the foundation of schism, had prolonged it to such a duration, and had in so incredible a manner brought the church down to the ground. So long as the hankering after benefices causes this same thing to be done, so long shall we look in vain for a union of the church.

What Clemangis here says, we find confirmed, when we come to obtain a more exact knowledge of the intrigues which had brought about the election of Pope Alexander, and of all that contributed to promote the evils that followed in its train. So far was it from being true, that anything had been reformed, everything, in fact, went on from worse to worse, till the evil reached its climax, and thus the fall of his power was a necessary result. The person, who, at the last moment, had laboured most to bring about this election, and who from henceforward obtained the greatest influence, was Cardinal *Balthazar Cossa*, of Bologna, a man stained with every crime,—one who could only in *these* times of extreme corruption have risen to the highest spiritual dignities. He had, as Theodoric of Niem, an eye-witness of many of these events, relates, begun his career when a young man, in a manner worthy of himself, as a pirate: then he had spent several years at the University of Pisa, as Theodoric of Niem characteristically expresses it, *sub figura studentis;* following the habit he had acquired from his earlier occupation as a pirate, to wake by night, and to sleep all day, "or till three o'clock in the afternoon." Pope Boniface IX., under whom the worst characters were chiefly promoted, drew him to the Roman court and made him a cardinal. He exercised, as papal legate at Bologna, an unlimited dominion,[1] and he made use of it to enrich himself in every possible way. All means to this end were right enough for him. He shrunk from no crime, practised the most unblushing extortions, and

[1] Theod. de Niem de fatis Joh. XXIII, c. 9, u. 10, bei H. v. d. Hardt. ii. p. 348.

every species of impudent simony, and abandoned himself to every excess. In such a time of corruption, he was able by his immense wealth to obtain great influence, which enabled him to carry out his objects. Already, at the council of Pisa, he was to be chosen pope; but he did not then choose it himself, preferring to push forward another first, who could present a better show for himself, and whom he might still be able to govern entirely. It was that weak old man, Alexander V., whom Balthazar had wholly under his control. Of course, a papal government which stood under the influence of so infamous a character as Balthazar Cossa, was suited neither to gain new friends nor to put down the schism. Thus what had been gained, was three popes instead of two. Balthazar Cossa was more at home in diplomatic negotiations and enterprises of war, than in spiritual affairs. He understood how to draw off his old friend, the companion of his debaucheries, King Ladislaus of Naples, from the cause of pope Gregory. He understood how to bring it about to have Rome open her gates to Alexander V. The latter was now invited to take his seat in Rome. But Balthazar Cossa, who would have him more in his own power at Bologna, did not allow of this; he must go to Bologna; and there he soon died, in the year 1410. A far-spread report accused Cardinal Cossa of deliberately taking him off by poison. The former now mounted the papal throne under the name of John XXIII., the greatest monster that had ever, or at least that had, since the abominations in the tenth and eleventh centuries, polluted the papal chair. As Balthazar Cossa had until now risen from one high post to another by bribery and corruption, so he hoped he should by the same means succeed as pope, in whatever he undertook; that by his money, his power, and his policy, he should be able to repress all the counteractive influences of that better spirit, which, for so long a time, had been earnestly and ardently longing after a reformation of the church. And at the beginning all seemed to go well. He hoped he should be able to gain over the University of Paris, whose free voices he had most reason to fear, by the bestowment of numerous benefices and other gratifications. D'Ailly reports in his treatise on the Necessity of Reformation, which he composed a little later and near the beginning of the council of

Constance, that pope John, who had probably been told by some Ultramontanes, that if he only gained over the University of Paris, he had nothing further to fear, heaped upon it a multitude of benefices to the injury of other corporations, and that of his own court.[1] With the same object in view, he created Gerson's teacher and friend, the above-mentioned Pierre d'Ailly, archbishop of Cambray, a cardinal. It had indeed already been ordered by the council of Pisa, that after three years a council should be held to carry forward the reformation of the church, which had not been completed at Pisa. Pope John hoped to be able in this case also again to disappoint the expectation of the nations, and turn the council into a farce. He actually convoked in Rome, at the time fixed upon in the year 1412, a reformatory council; but who could expect that anything whatever would result from a council in Rome, and under the management of the most abominable of popes? Only a few Italian prelates attended, and having busied themselves with some unimportant matters, the council, after a few sessions, broke up.[2] We find in a letter by Nicholas of Clemangis, a man whose authority can generally be relied upon, a story, which, if not literally true, yet serves to mark the aspect in which such a council under such a pope must needs have presented itself to contemporaries. At the celebration of the *missa spiritus sancti* previous to the opening of this council, when the *Veni Creator spiritus* was sung according to the usual custom, an owl flew suddenly, with a startling hoot, into the middle of

1 De necessitate reformationis cap. 26, in Gers. opp. tom. ii, p. 900: Nec est silentio transeundum, quod ipse dominus Johannes papa, informatus forsan per aliquos ultramontanos, petentes in sua curia, quod si universitati studii Parisiensis petitionibus quibuslibet exorabilem se rederet, tuto regnaret, nec tunc haberet de reliquis suae obedientiae in aliquo dubitare. Ipse quodam servili timore, adeo mirabiles et prius a seculis inauditas praerogativas concessit, in gratiis exspectativis per directorem et magistros universitatis ejusdem, qui a modo certo numero non comprehenduntur, ut prius obtentis ab ipso per aliquas, nedum aliorum universalium studiorum graduatis, sed etiam suae curiae officialibus, quibuscunque et quantumcunque sufficientibus, enormiter derogarit.

2 The remarks of Nichol. of Clemangis on this council, which he wrote in the year 1416, are: Convocaverat ante quatuor ferme annos Romae concilium ecclesiae, maxima quorundam impulsus instantia, Balthasar ille perfidissimus nuper e Petri sede (quam turpissime foedabat) ejectus, in quo paucissimis concurrentibus extraneis, ex aliquibus qui affuerant Italicis ac curialibus, sessiones aliquot tenuit, in rebus supervacuis nihilque ad utilitatem ecclesia pertinentibus, tempus terendo, consumptas. Super materia concilii gener. p. 75.

the church, and perching itself upon a beam opposite the pope, stared him steadily in the face, at which the prelates whispered round: "Behold yonder the Holy Ghost in the shape of an owl!" The pope seemed greatly embarrassed and annoyed. First, he turned pale, then red; and, finally, had no other way of helping the matter but by dissolving the meeting.[1] The story, to be sure, is not literally correct, as here related; but it is instructive to learn, from an eye-witness, the real fact upon which this story was founded. Theodoric of Niem relates, that once, on the festival of Whitsuntide, while the pope was holding divine service in his chapel, during the chaunt of the *Veni Creator spiritus*, an owl flew into the chapel; and this was considered in Rome a bad omen.[2] Such was the foundation of the story. What Theodoric of Niem, an eye-witness, and an altogether trustworthy reporter, relates in so simple a way, did undoubtedly happen; just as elsewhere in history incidents not without symbolical significance and prophetic truth, do actually occur, though a vulgar spirit of analysis, whose bent is to trivialize all historical facts, vainly attempts to deny it. Not without good reason did this incident leave a singularly strong impression on the minds of many living in those times. They might well look upon it as something ominous. In this way it came about that the fact was transferred to that hypocritical farce of the self-called reformatory council, whose character it so well befitted; and the incident was shaped by the imagination into the form of a miraculous event.

Meantime the University of Paris had been zealously engaged in preparing for a reformation of the church. Soon after the close of the council at Pisa, and the election of Alexander V., Gerson delivered, before the king of France, in the name of the university, a discourse of great weight, as containing the exposition of its principles. It was not as yet understood, for so we may gather from Gerson's discourse, that all hopes of removing the schism were to be again disappointed, and that the evil must go on increasing. Gerson had fixed his hopes upon the council announced

1 Ibid.

2 Quia dum quadam vice, in festo Pentecostes, dictus Balthasar vesperas solemnes in capella majori sui palatii, prope Basilicam S. Petri, ut moris est, celebraret, dum inciperetur hymnus Veni creator spiritus, ilico adfuit et volavit illic in alto bubo seu noctua. Theodorici de Niem de vita ac fatis Constantiensibus Johannis XXIII. bei Herm. v. d. Hardt. ii. p. 375.

beforehand, which was to meet after three years. "All well-disposed persons"—says he—"ought to labour with the fact full in view that after three years this council is to assemble."[1] Already he meditated far-reaching plans, embracing more than simply the reformation of the Western church. The prospect opened before him of a restoration of church concord which should unite in one the churches of the West and of the East. The best of opportunities, as he supposed, were now present for bringing about a union with the Greeks, inasmuch as they now had for pope a learned man of this nation, who had himself visited the East as papal legate.[2] And the impending council seemed to him to be peculiarly fitted to prepare the way for such a union; since it was to be expected that the Greeks also would be induced to send delegates to it. The supposed restoration of church unity at the council of Pisa, appeared to him as an invitation to labour more earnestly for the glorifying of the church; for he reckoned to this the doing away of that ancient schism. And that the former had been successfully accomplished at the council of Pisa appeared to him as a sign which augured favourably for the latter.[3] Undoubtedly, if the position taken by the Parisian theologians could possibly have gained the general sanction, then by means of the already mentioned distinction between the necessary and the accidental, the mutable and the immutable, in the determinations and ordinances of the church, the business of bringing about such a union of the churches would have been very much facilitated. "Men should not"—said he—"feel themselves universally bound, by the positive determinations of the popes, to recognize and hold fast *one* kind of church-governance as necessary, in things which had no direct concern with the truths of evangelical faith." He says with good reason, This consideration, rightly apprehended, is the principal key to the effecting of a union between Greeks and Latins;[4] for they differ in many modes and ways of life which perhaps would not result in any injury to the divine law. We should in all such things follow the principle of Augustin, that national customs ought invariably to be respected. Among such unimportant differences he reckoned the distinction with regard to the use of leavened or unleavened bread. The Greeks, he

1 Sermo coram rege, xii., consideratio. Opp. tom. ii., p. 152 C.
2 P. 144 A. 3 P. 149. 4 P. 148.

thinks, would fall into an error of faith, only in case they should maintain, that the first gospels had reported what was untrue in their account of the time of the paschal supper. Among these he reckoned also the marriage of priests among the Greeks, and several other things. According to the same principle of a manifold variety perfectly consistent with the essential unity of the church, in the particular church institutions, he requires also the re-establishment of the liberties of the Gallican church, in spite of the contradiction of the Roman curialists. It is remarkable that Gerson, while he maintained the necessity of agreement in the truths of faith to the neglect of subordinate differences which might exist without injury to the former, impugns as a vulgar error the opinion, that every man may be saved in his own particular religion.[1] We may doubtless infer from this, that the corruption of the church, which allowed so little to be known of the practical influence of the truths of faith, had already led many to hold these truths themselves as of little practical account. Gerson signalizes as opposite errors, the assertion of Marsilius of Padua and of Wickliff, that the pope ought not to have secular property, nor secular rule, and the principle expressed by Boniface VIII., that to the *one* spiritual power of the pope, all secular authority must be subjected.[2] Much as Gerson was disposed to allow a certain degree of freedom to church development, yet he could not tolerate the idea, that this freedom should pass beyond the limits of such a uniformity of doctrine, as had shaped itself into a system among the theologians of the University of Paris. The Parisian theology was to constitute a legislative power for all theological development, so as to preclude the possibility of all revolution. This explains the conduct of Gerson in opposing the freer movement which proceeded from Bohemia. He cites the remarkable words of the Duke of Lancaster to the Duke of Burgundy, respecting the mutual relation of the theological tendencies of those times at Oxford and at Paris. "We have, in England, men of finer imagination; but the Parisians have a true, solid, and safe theology."[3] At this time, the University of Paris

1 Et dicere contrarium est error communis, quod unusquisque sit salvatus in secta sua. P. 146 C.

2 P. 147 B.

3 Habemus in Anglia viros subtiliores in imaginationibus, sed Parisienses veram habent solidam et securam theologiam. P. 149 B.

supposed that, from the foundation which had been laid at the council of Pisa, the restoration of church unity must go everywhere into effect. Alexander V. appeared as the sole legitimate pope; and Gerson proposed, that the other princes and nations should also be prevailed upon, by negotiation, to recognize him as such. The corruption of the church, and the longing after and the presentiment of its renovation, called forth in different countries, and in the case of different men, and in different forms —as, for example, in Bohemia, in the case of John Miliz, in the case of Matthias of Janow, and as we see also in France, in the case of Nicholas of Clemangis and Gerson,—the expectation of the near-approaching destruction of the world. Yet even in regard to this matter again, the sober, intellectual spirit of Gerson clearly manifests itself. He says: "But who knows whether it is not God's will, that the end of the world should draw nigh, and that all should betake themselves to the one Christian faith, and to that common union, which must precede the end of the world, though I announce nothing as certain, and prophesy nothing about what may be expected, when God would not reveal this, his own secret, to Apostles and Prophets!"[1]

The expectations which were cherished when Gerson delivered his discourse in the name of the Paris University, were destined soon to be disappointed. It could not fail to be very soon known how egregiously men had been mistaken, when the events which we have described took place. How much could be learned from the experience of a few years! Nor did the instructive lesson pass unheeded. In vain had John XXIII. tried to conciliate the University of Paris by private benefits. In vain had he tried to draw over to his interest such a man as d'Ailly. The men who had laboured most to bring about the meeting of a general council at Pisa, were the men who laboured also most zealously to arrange matters so that another council might effect what this council had failed to accomplish. Cardinal d'Ailly, to guard against the danger of again falling into the same mistakes, presented to view, in a letter addressed to his disciple Gerson, the difficulties lying in the way of a restoration of unity and of a reformation of the church by a general council.[2] If, says he, a

1 P. 152 A.

2 De difficultate reformationis in concilio universali. Opp. Gerson. tom. ii. p. 867.

new general council should actually be convened, of what use would it be? Suppose even, that all three of the popes should abdicate of their own accord, or else be forced to leave their places; and instead of them, a new one should be elected, as at Pisa; yet the cardinals would again take the choice into their own hands, and they would again choose a man out of their own body, who would be no better than the former ones. And thus the old mischief will go on as long as the cardinals remain the same. But suppose the council should light upon some other method of election, and the choice should fall upon a man of an altogether different stamp from the earlier ones; then the cardinals would, without doubt, refuse to acknowledge a person so entirely different from themselves, and some new and worse division would grow out of this. Thus a complication of difficulties meets us on all sides. He points to the council of Pisa as a warning example. Although the cardinals had in their letters, sent forth in all directions, promised a council for the reformation of the church in its head and members, yet they had chosen out of their body Alexander V., who, although a great theologian, yet was wholly inexperienced in the things belonging to his office; and what the cardinals required of him he had conceded without demur, and without daring to refuse anything. Hence they had overwhelmed him with one new demand after another, and could never have enough.

Upon this, chancellor Gerson composed his Treatise on the mode in which the unity of the church should be restored and its reformation brought about at a council;[1] where he endeavoured to point out how the difficulties and hindrances presented to view by d'Ailly, could be met and disposed of. Gerson proceeds on the principle, ever maintained by him, that all positive laws must yield to the greatest good of the whole—the power as well of the civil magistrate as of the head of the church, was conditioned on this. If kings by the law of inheritance could be deposed where the good of the state required it; how much more should popes, created such by election, be liable to ejection from office, when the good of the church required it? On this point, Gerson expresses himself in a way deserving of notice: "Will

1 De modis uniendi ac reformandi ecclesiam. P. 162.

it be said that a pope, whose father and grandfather before him hardly got beans enough perhaps to satisfy the cravings of hunger, that the son of some Venetian fisherman, must maintain the papal dignity to the hurt of the entire commonwealth of the church, and with wrong to so many princes and prelates? For the sake of this, must so much ruin accrue to the souls of men? Look—says he—a pope is a man, descended from men, earth from earth, a sinner and subject to sin, the son of a poor peasant a few days ago; he is exalted to the papal chair. Does such an one become a sinless man, a saint, without the least repentance for his sins, without confessing them, without contrition of heart? Who has made him a saint? Not the Holy Ghost; for it is not dignity of station that brings the influences of the Holy Ghost, but the grace of God and love; not the authority of the office, for it may be enjoyed by bad men as well as good." The popes might, as history taught, fall into precisely the same sins with those who are not priests. "We see"—says he —"as clear as noon-day, that the actions of modern prelates and priests are not of a spiritual kind, but secular and fleshly." The higher the position held by the pope, the more bound was he to observe the law of Christ.[1] Were there actually a universally-acknowledged pope, it would be his duty to use every means for restoring peace to the church, even to the laying down of his own office. Where, then, there were three, quarrelling with one another for the papacy, they were bound to renounce their arrogated rights. As the church of Christ is clearly manifested to be one, so there should be but one pope, recognized by all and manifest to all. But how could this be so, when two or three are quarrelling with one another about the papacy, as if they were contending for the eternal inheritance? He cites, as opposed to this, the words of Christ to the apostles, Luke xxii. 25. In the next place, it was evident that Christ gave no greater power to Peter than he himself exercised while on earth. The pope, therefore, had no other to administer. Why presume,

1 Item papa non est supra dei evangelium, quod sic ejus auctoritas esset major auctoritate Christi, nec tunc ejus potestas derivaretur a Christo: subjicitur ergo ut alter Christianus in omnibus praecepto et mandato Christi. Imo tanto magis ad ipsum servandum obligatur, quanto magis est in dignitate et perfectiori statu constitutus. P. 167 C.

then, to contend for that which does not belong to him? Nor was it to be believed that, if Paul had said to Peter, thou art not pope or Roman bishop; thou art only bishop of Antioch, but I am bishop of the Roman church, he would have contended with Paul or any other man saying the same, about the papacy; but would simply have said, I bid you God-speed; rule in the name of God, as that is what you seek. See then, ye believers"—says he—"that if we obey those who are thus contending with each other and rending in pieces the church, we grievously sin. Long ere this, would they have quitted the grasp of their tyrannical rule, had you not indulged them with your obedience."

But in holding fast to the abstract notion alone, that all else must give place to the greatest good of the church, Gerson was driven into principles contrary to good morals, and allowed that the end sanctifies the means. For he says, "If those two or three will not yield, it remains only to resort to stronger measures; to depose them and expel them from the communion of the church; to subtract our obedience to them. But still if by these means the highest interest of the church cannot be promoted, then we must bring about the holy concord of the church by cunning, by fraud, by force of arms, by promises, by presents, and money; finally, by resorting to imprisonment and the taking of life, or by any other means whatever whereby the unity of the church can be promoted." In inviting men to renounce their obedience to popes who gave scandal to the entire church, he says: "For if we suppose the case, that the universal church, whose head is Christ, had no pope; still a believer, who should depart from the world in charity, would be saved; for when two or three individuals are contending with each other about the papacy, and the truth on this matter is not known to the universal church;[1] the fact that this or that individual is pope cannot be an article of faith, nor can anything depend upon it, nor any Christian be bound to believe it. And for this reason the apostles, in drawing up the creed, did not say: I believe in the pope, or in the vicar of Christ; for the common faith of

1 Quod si nec isto modo poterit ecclesia proficere, tunc dolis, fraudibus, armis, violentia, potentia, promissionibus, donis et pecuniis, tandem carceribus, mortibus convenit sanctissimam unionem ecclesiae, et conjunctionem quomodolibet procurare. P. 170 D.

Christians does not repose upon the pope, who is but a single person, and may err; but they said: I believe in one holy, catholic church. He distinguishes the outward apostolic church, to which even wicked men might belong, from the catholic church as the community of saints. How could popes, then, belong to this latter church, who for the sake of their own private advantage, were contending for the papacy, and lived in the condition of mortal sin? He starts the objection: "Should the legitimate pope John convoke the council, and choose to preside over it, who would venture to oppose his will? Who would venture to seek the greatest good of the church?" As the popes had already, by their special and general reservations, robbed the universal church, laid waste the monasteries, invented a thousand ways of bestowing benefices and getting money; so it would not be easy to find a man who would be inclined to give up so gainful a papacy and give peace to the universal church. But suppose the pope not to be serious in convoking the council; then, on the penalty of incurring a mortal sin, the prelates with the princes were bound to convoke it as soon as possible; to cite before it the pope and those contending with him about the papacy, and if they refused to appear, to depose them. But suppose the pope should convoke the council, but not in a safe place. Christians were not bound to go there. But suppose the place were safe, yet subject to the pope's dominion, so that there could be no liberty of speech there. Christians, who are no longer servants of the law, but free sons of grace, were not bound to appear there. Whenever, then, the question on hand related to the deposing of the pope or to a censure of his conduct, or a limitation of his power, it noways belonged to him to convoke the general council, but to the prelates, the cardinals, bishops, and secular rulers; but where the question on hand related to the reformation of a province or a kingdom, to the extirpation of heresies, the defence of the faith, then it was the business of the pope and his cardinals to convoke the council.[1] It appeared to him the only means for deliverance, that the emperor should convoke the council, and, as defender of the faith, preside over it, and find some method of restoring again the flock of Christ.[2] D'Ailly had made the objection that the

1 P. 172. 2 P. 179 C.

next council, inasmuch as it was but a continuation of the council of Pisa, would bring nothing better to pass. To this Gerson replies, There can be nothing so good but that there may be something still better. Since then the new council may do something still better than the first, where, according to the opinion of all, a certain over-hastiness prevailed, and where everything had been done with heat and precipitancy and not with due deliberation, so that in truth it had not answered its end, of restoring unity to the church and bringing all under one pope; and since too many foreign matters had been introduced at that time; so the future council might possibly prove to be a holier and more perfect one.[1] Although Gerson acknowledged the necessity of a change in the laws, to render them more conformable to the times, still he would not concede to the pope the right of dispensing with any laws enacted by a council, or of making any modifications in them. He well understood how everything would thus be unsettled again. Such power ought not to be entrusted to any single man: it should be reserved to another general council.[2] He then complains of the arbitrary deviations from laws enacted by the older councils, laws which had become almost a matter of ridicule. The most wanton extortions in filling up church offices had proceeded from the court at Avignon, because none of the cardinals were able to keep up royal state, unless daily sustained by supplies flowing to them from all quarters through such modes of gain. And when that new union, which he calls a *talis qualis*, was brought about at Pisa, the extortions had been carried to a still greater extent.[3] He proposes that a new council should be held every five or six years, where a more complete reformation in all things might be carried through.[4]

Gerson says,[5] "Because the prelates of our time are dumb dogs, these mischievous constitutions and reservations have taken the place of rights and laws; so that it is frightful to recount the number of evils which have thereby been occasioned; as for example that the intimates of the cardinals, occasionally murderers, ignorant men, cooks, grooms, mule-drivers, may obtain canonicates in cathedral churches; while those who have obtained a

1 P. 136 C. 2 P. 182 D. 3 P. 185 A.
4 P. 170 A. 5 P. 194 A.

degree in any of the faculties cannot get at them." D'Ailly had suggested the query, as to what should be done in case the pope with his cardinals persisted in clinging to the old corruptions, and gave themselves no concern about any of the laws enacted by the council; to which Gerson replies: "As those priests of Baal, who themselves devoured the offerings presented to Baal, and told the people on the next day that Baal had devoured them, and were all destroyed when the cheat came to be exposed, so was it with those high priests who lied to God and men with indulgences, dispensations, and blessings, who preached much falsehood, calling good evil, and evil good. If these were not wholly extirpated, so that *pope Boniface's plantation*, which God had not planted, should be destroyed and utterly banished from human society, he feared the church would never be reformed in the head and members, but that extortions would continually rise in enormity, till the pope and cardinals got into their hands all the property in the world; and then there would be no apostolical chair, but only an apostatical one; no divine see, but a seat of Satan, on which no man ought to sit, but from which every man should recoil. No prelate,[1] when the reservations and valuations of the benefices were made, having shown the least opposition, either from weakness or ignorance or a regard to their own advantage, the pope and cardinals had, for nearly a hundred years, declared that those reservations had obtained the validity of law; and that a general council could not alter them; which was false. No. Let the prelates rise up, let them present to God the sacrifice of righteousness, and let them try to banish for ever those robberies by the Roman chancery; for such things could not be prescribed to the prejudice of the church, things that conflicted with its very being. To get hold of this money from the benefices, thousands of officials had been appointed at the Roman court, and perhaps not one could be found among them all who was there for the promotion of virtue. "There," says he, "the daily talk is of castles, of territorial domains, of the different kinds of weapons, of gold; but seldom or never of chastity, alms, righteousness, faith, or holy manners; so that the court, once a spiritual one, has become a secular,

1 P. 194 C.

devilish, tyrannical court, and worse in manners and civil transactions than any other." How can the pope—says he[1]—be servant of the servants of God on earth, when he is more ready to please princes, kings, and tyrants, than God and his saints? Were the pope, indeed, servant of the servants of God, as he styles himself in the beginning of his bulls, he would obey and serve the poor who are God's servants, or at least show care for them by works of mercy. "But where will you find charity in a pope?" He complains that no poor, no pious man, seeking help in spiritual or bodily distress, could be admitted into the papal palace. You may, indeed, see soldiers and tyrants decked in purple go in to him; but never an ill-clad, poor man, though he may be learned and conscientious. He is no longer "servant of the servants of God," but rather, "John, the lord of lords." When tyrannical princes, men of bad lives, oppressors of the church, apply to the pope with their petitions for some castle or other, or to obtain a beneficium, or a bishopric for their favourites, the petitions of such are sooner listened to than those of better princes."[2] The power, he affirmed, did not belong to the pope, which was commonly ascribed to him, of binding in heaven and on earth;[3] all that had been given him was the power of announcing and of absolving in spiritual things. He did but announce that he whom he absolved was absolved, he whom he bound was bound in the church. Not the pope, but God only could forgive sins. If it should be asked, to what end was the convocation of such a general council, the answer was, that it was called more particularly for two objects; first, the union of the church under one head; secondly, union in the customs and laws of the primitive church. And if it should be objected, that the means were doubtful, and therefore unsafe, especially as there was already a pope;[4] to this he replied, that although we have, according to right, but one pope, yet in point of fact there are two others besides. Let there be assembled, then, a council to carry out what was resolved upon at the council of Pisa, or, if this could not be done, as was probable, and if the two other popes were ready to appear at a general council, and to abdicate there, in case John XXIII. would do the same, then the latter was bound, if a deliverance of the church was in no other way pos-

1 P. 197 C. 2 P. 197 A. 3 P. 198 A. 4 P. 181.

sible, to give up willingly for this object even more than a papacy, so that the whole christian commonwealth might not, for the sake of one individual who was a sinner and neither exemplary nor virtuous, be brought to destruction. Were he a virtuous man, he would follow the example of Christ, who came not to do his own will, but the will of Him that sent him. He would submit to the will of the whole church and lay down his papacy, if He required him to do so. Even though there were a true, undoubted, and universally acknowledged pope, he would be necessitated to do this by the demand of a general council, in case the church could not otherwise be helped; and to obey without contradiction all the ordinances of that general council. D'Ailly had presented the objection, that in case of a vacancy of the imperial throne, and a contention among the elector-princes, obeying different popes, a convocation of the council from such a quarter could not be made; to which Gerson[1] replies: if this could not be done, then the convocation of the council would devolve, first, on other princes; next, on other societies and secular lords; then on citizens of the towns and peasants, and even down to the poorest old woman; for as the church might consist even of the poorest old woman, as for example, at the death of Christ, when the virgin Mary only remained,—so by such an one a general council could be called for the deliverance of the church. Furthermore, d'Ailly had made the objection, that a newly elected emperor was bound by the oath given to his pope. To this Gerson replies:[2] no oath can be binding to the prejudice of the universal church. He cites, for illustration, the case of a monarch, cruel and ferocious to his people; in such a case the people were no longer bound by the oath they had given to him, but the subjects were made judges over their master.[3]

It seems to Gerson[4] desirable, that neither of the popes, nor yet any one from the college of cardinals, should be made pope; for, as the latter were inured to the practice of the old abuses, and extortions, it was to be feared, that they would persist in them, and that the evil might be made worse. Therefore, to

1 P 189 A. P. 189 D.

3 Sicut si rex iniquus in populum sibi subditum vellet desaevire, non tenentur ejus subditi, juramentum homagii et fidelitatis olim praestitum ei in aliquo observare.

4 P. 196 B.

forefend such mischief, a determination of the general council was to be desired, that in future no person should be chosen pope from the body of cardinals, but that he should be chosen from the several provinces and kingdoms according to a certain order. Then, after the election of such a pope, it seems to him especially requisite, that his power should for the future be limited, as the pope had taken many rights of the church into his own hands.

The peace between the pope and King Ladislaus did not last long. The latter suddenly attacked the pope's residence. So extremely odious had the latter rendered himself at Rome, that Ladislaus found little difficulty in making himself master of the city. Pope John fled in great trepidation on horseback, in May of the year 1413, to Florence; thence he went to Bologna, and to several cities of Lombardy, and had an interview with the new emperor Sigismond, who had been invited by all the well-disposed to effect a cure of the corruption and of the schism in the church, and for this purpose to hasten the meeting of a general council. A common political interest joined together the pope and the emperor in the quarrel with King Ladislaus. Besides, the pope could not fail to understand, that it was impossible for him any longer to succeed in eluding the general desire after a reformatory council. He consented to the meeting of such a council. One important question only remained to be decided,—that of the place where the council should assemble. Aretin, the pope's secretary at that time, relates, that the pope, before sending off his legates to the emperor,[1] told him that all depended on the place of the council; he would not go to a spot where the emperor was the more powerful. He would, for the sake of appearances, give his legates ample powers to treat on this point with the emperor. To this the ostensible instruction to the legates should relate. But he would secretly instruct them and restrict the choice to a few cities; and these cities he named to Aretin. But, on dismissing his legates, it occurred to him all at once, that he would trust the whole matter to their hands. He said he would leave everything to their discretion; and in proof of it, he tore in pieces the secret instructions which he was intending to give them. So states Aretin, who was present during

1 Commentarius in Muratori script. rer. ital. tom. xix., p. 928 C.

these secret transactions between the pope and his legates.[1] The legates, bound by no restrictions, suffered themselves to be persuaded by the emperor to accept of the free German city of Constance as the place for the meeting of the council. This was, to be sure, a perilous choice to the interests of the pope; but he could not now recede with honour. The historian Aretin, in relating this, adds: "None can resist God's will." Meanwhile King Ladislaus died. The pope was urged by his kinsmen and friends to return to Rome. They augured to him no good of his journey to Constance. Gladly would he have returned to Rome, instead of going to Constance. But it was now too late to alter the thing with a good grace; and he still indulged a hope that he should, as he had often done before, win the victory by his craftiness and his money; and, at Bologna, where he finally took up his quarters, he provided himself with a sumptuous equipage, with which he intended to make his journey to Constance, and by which he hoped to make a great impression on many.[2] The pope and the emperor Sigismond now put forth in common their proclamation for a council, which should assemble at Constance, in November of the year 1414, for the restoration of unity to the church, and for the reformation of the church in its head and members.

The cardinal d'Ailly prepared the way for the doings of the council by his work on the Necessity of the Reformation of the Church to be brought about by the council.[3] He pointed it out as the first thing to be done, that the council should resolve not to break up until the choice of a pope, recognized by all Christendom, should be effected. The shortest way to this, in his opinion, was, that, without any regard to the decrees of the council of Pisa, the three popes should all resign their dignities. If this were done, an upright man, of regular, scientific education, should be elected by twelve prelates, more or less, who should receive full powers for this purpose from the council, with the concurrence of the cardinals.[4] Moreover, d'Ailly maintains, that as a king who abuses his power may

1 Commentarius in Muratori script. rer. ital. tom. xix. p. 928 D.

2 Theod. de Niem de fatis Joh. XXIII. c. 40. l. 1. p. 387.

3 Monita de necessitate reformationis ecclesiae in capite et in membris. In Gers. opp. ii., p. 885.

4 P. 886.

be dethroned by the people, for whose greatest good he is there, so *a fortiori* this could be done in the case of a pope, who is chosen for the express purpose of teaching the laws of God.[1] He complains of the great state, which the cardinals thought it necessary to display, and in order to display which they were forced to sequestrate to their own use all the revenues of the church. "For"—says he[2]—"of what use is all that wonderful pomp; that he who to-day, perhaps, is content to appear publicly as the humble retainer of a clergyman, to-morrow, made a cardinal, feels as if the world was scarcely enough for him, and appears in as much state as if he were leading an army to battle." He would see those abuses removed, that cardinals should appropriate to themselves archbishoprics, bishoprics, abbacies; should never be seen by their dioceses, but cause the functions to be discharged by ignorant, worthless hirelings, out of all which grew much evil to the church. He expresses the wish that the council would counteract the mischiefs occasioned by the suffragan bishops in Germany. These, having obtained their offices by simony, were accustomed to practise, in their turn, every species of extortion on the clergy and the people, and to push bargains for giving ordinations. The council should establish certain rules against these malpractices. He thinks that, as so much corruption proceeded from the Roman court, this should first be reformed; that those who made a trade of spiritual things, and the instruments of simony, should be[3] utterly thrust out from that court. He considers it as a consequence of simony, and of those other malpractices, that the heresies in Bohemia and Moravia had made such head-way.[4] A strenuous effort should be made to banish heresies and the authors of them from Bohemia and Moravia. But there was no way in which this could be thoroughly done, except by applying some remedy to the evil which had given occasion for all attacks upon the papacy, namely, the corruption of the Roman court. That court should be brought back to its ancient good manners.[5] The same d'Ailly composed, about this time, two letters addressed to Pope John,[6] relating to the same subject. He adverts in them to certain language on the necessity of a church reformation, which had once been uttered in a solemn assembly before pope Urban V.

[1] P. 896. [2] P. 888 D. [3] P. 898 C. [4] P. 901 C. [5] P. 902 A. [6] P. 876.

He deems it the more necessary to refer to this, because soon afterwards, on the death of Gregory XI., the schism, under the effects of which they were now suffering, had grown out of the corruptions of the church, to the correction of which this language had reference. He says:[1] "Although I am no prophet, nor the son of a prophet, yet I venture to say, without asserting anything rash, that if at the next council means are not found to remove these scandals, by the entire healing of the schism and by the reformation of so corrupt a church, then we must set it down as probable, that still more and greater evils will ensue." He states that some took comfort from the fact that the abbot Bernard and others had found it necessary to complain of the corruption of the church, and yet its downfall did not follow. In like manner, it might still prolong its existence. He affirms, on the contrary, that when the measure of sins is filled up, divine judgment will interpose, and the children must often atone for guilt contracted by their fathers. Next he adverts to the opinion of those inconsiderate men, from whom the church had to expect the greatest danger, whose motto was, Let the world take its natural course, and who looked upon everything alike with the same indifference.[2] Furthermore, he mentions the opinion of a certain class, who held the evils of the church to be incurable, and supposed that, as all kingdoms have had their end, so the dominion of the church was now, by the fault of its presiding officers, hastening to its decline; in contradiction to which he says, a divine judgment, it is true, may be threatening the church; but still should an improvement of manners take place, should the superfluous pomp of the prelates be moderated, should men, in heart and deed, repent and turn to God, it was to be hoped that God would, in some ineffable way, send deliverance, and stay the course of judgment.

Although Pope John relied with some confidence upon the influence of his wealth, upon the great number of prelates devoted to him or bound up in his interests, and upon the force of intrigue, yet it was not without anxiety that he set out upon the journey to Constance. On his way through Tyrol he had

1 P. 880 A.

2 Error valde perversus eorum, qui dicebant: veniat quod poterit, conformemus nos huic saeculo tempestivius. P. 879 A.

an interview with Duke Frederic of Austria, wishing to take advantage of the bad terms on which the duke stood with the emperor Sigismond, the zealous promoter of church reform; and he made the duke agree that in case the pope should not find himself safe in Constance, the duke should afford him protection in his neighbouring domain. Thus his plan was already laid. It was already his intention, in case he failed of carrying out his schemes at Constance, to try the experiment of making his escape by flight, so as to break up the council. During the journey the pope's carriage was upset in the snow. This was looked upon by himself and many others as a bad omen. He arrived at Constance on the 28th of October, and after several adjournments the council was opened. The pope was calculating that the votes would be taken by the number of persons, and was therefore hoping to carry out his measures by the majority of single votes, particularly from the Italian nation, upon which he might depend. But his designs were penetrated and defeated. In a proposition relating to the form of transacting business, the fact was noticed, that the pope had on his side a majority of poor prelates belonging to the Italians, exceeding the number of deputies present from any other nation; that he had appointed fifty chamberlains; that by the administration of various oaths, by presents or by threats he had secured numbers to himself; so that by the majority of votes he could manage all matters as he pleased. To guard against unfairness from this cause, it was deemed best that the votes should be taken by nations rather than by persons.[1] This proposition was carried, in spite of all the opposition of the papal party. The council was divided for the present into four nations, Italians, French, Germans, and English. The deputies of each nation held their separate meetings, and whatever was determined upon by the majority in these meetings, passed as the judgment of the nation. Then the committees of the several different nations reported their separate decrees in the general congregations of the deputies of all the four nations, and whatever was decreed by the majority of the four votes in these meetings was to be proclaimed in the public sessions as a decree of the council. It would be important, again, for the interest of the pope, if none but bishops and abbots were

[1] V. d. Hardt. tom. ii. p. 230.

allowed a definitive vote in the council. Among these, independent thinkers were fewer in number; among the titular-bishops and abbots especially, were many creatures of the pope. But it was endeavoured to prevent this also. Even two cardinals, of whom one was Cardinal d'Ailly, declared in the discussions on this matter, that from the time of the foundation of the universities, doctors of theology, doctors of the canon and the civil law, men to whom were entrusted the office of teaching and preaching, could not but have more weight than titular-bishops and abbots, who neither preached nor taught, nor had any cure of souls; and that the learning of the former must be set as a make-weight over against the advantage which the higher but ignorant prelates obtained from their authority. In deciding on matters of faith especially, theological learning could not be dispensed with. Furthermore, inferior ecclesiastics who exercised the office of preaching and had the cure of souls, had a better right to join in the discussion of purely spiritual matters, than those who were bishops merely by title, and abbots. Cardinal St Marci called the ignorant prelates mitred asses. It was remarked, in the next place, that in business relating to the extermination of schism, and the restoration of peace to the church, the princes and their envoys were not to be excluded from the right of voting, since the matter was so intimately connected with the interest of princes and their subjects. Moreover, their assistance was required to execute the decrees of the council on these matters.[1] This proposition also was adopted; and thus the most free-minded, sagacious, and independent men obtained great influence at the council, an influence which the pope had special reason to dread. The prelates devoted to the pope demanded, that the first business to be attended to should be the confirmation of the council of Pisa; from this it was to be derived, as a necessary consequence, that the only business before the present council was to carry out the decrees of the council of Pisa; that the council therefore should proceed on the assumption that the authority of Pope John XXIII. was alone valid, and that the only thing necessary was to persuade or to compel the other two popes to submit.[2] Against

[1] V. d. Hardt. tom. ii. p. 228.

[2] Ibid. tom. iv. 1, p. 23 sq.

this, it was observed by d'Ailly[1] and others, that the council of Constance was not competent to confirm the council of Pisa, standing as it did on the same footing of authority with its own; and the only influence of such a proceeding would be to unsettle the minds of men, as if that general council were not a legal one by itself; but the council of Constance must be regarded as an independent continuation of the council at Pisa, and act accordingly. Thus they ought to proceed in reference to the reformation of the church in its head and members, and the restoration of church unity. Hence it might be inferred, that the council was competent, if the general good of the church required it and her union was to be secured in no other way, to oblige all the three popes to resign.

This form of transacting business could not fail to work favourably on the course of the council. The effects of the freer mode of proceeding soon manifested themselves. A man stained with so many vices as this Balthazar Cossa, whose crimes were known to so many, must soon be exposed. In the month of February, of the year 1415, a number of charges against the pope were laid before the council, relating to every species of vice and crime, and which, for the most part at least, were too true. To the pope, who had his secret spies in all quarters, this was soon reported; and at first he was thrown into great trepidation and anxiety, for his conscience accused him. He called round him certain cardinals and other prelates, his confidants, for the purpose of consulting what was to be done under these critical circumstances. He endeavoured to make himself friends by promises and presents. Already he entertained the design, as it is said, to appear before the council, and on many points confess his guilt as a sinful man; but to deny other things, and to claim that being pope, he could be deposed only for heresy. But there was no intention of pushing matters to an extreme. The crimes charged were of a nature so grossly bad, that the council must have hesitated about the propriety of bringing such matters into public discussion, to the disgrace of the papacy and of the church; matters which could not fail to scandalize many. It was considered a better course not to enter into any further examination of these matters, but

1 V. d. Hardt. tom. ii. p. 194.

only to take advantage of the bad position of the pope to induce him to resign, and thus make the way easier to an extermination of the schism. When this proposal was laid before the pope, he was at first very glad of an opportunity to get out of his worst difficulty so easily. But he concealed his satisfaction, and assuming a serious mien, declared himself inclined, for the sake of the peace of the church, to resign, if the other two popes would also do the same, since in this case alone would it be of any use.[1] But having somewhat recovered from his first fright, John began to assume again a more haughty tone. He drew up such forms of abdication as still left him a subterfuge, so that he might avoid the necessity of laying down the papal office. Men had learned caution from earlier experiences, and were disposed in all cases to be on the look out: hence they had some objections to find with each of the three forms of abdication which the pope proposed. It evidences the utter shamelessness and moral stupidity of Balthazar Cossa, a man conscious of such infamous crimes, that he was still capable of beginning the third form of abdication in words like these:[2] "Although the most holy father is bound by no vow, by no oath, or promise, which he may have given, yet he promises and vows, for the sake of the peace of the christian people of God and the church, that he will, of his own free accord, give them peace by his abdication, in person, or through his authorised agents," etc. Finally, John consented, on the first of March, to present before the assembled council a form of abdication such as should be prescribed for him. This announcement excited great joy, and the Te Deum was sung. Still an abdication of the pope conditioned on the proviso, that the other two popes should also do the same, failed of giving perfect satisfaction by reason of the condition itself, since it was impossible to reckon on the course which the other two popes might take. Now as the emperor Sigismond was about making a journey to Nice for the purpose of treating with Pope Benedict about his resignation, Pope John was strongly urged, for the sake of putting an end for ever to all evasions, to give the emperor himself full powers, or to send in his company an agent fully authorised to make the

1 V. d. Hardt. tom. iv. p. 41, and the words of Theod. of Niem, who then was a resident at the Roman court in Constance, tom. ii. c. 3, p. 391.

Tom. ii. c. 21, p. 234.

abdication in his name at once. But in the meantime, John had succeeded in bringing over to the side of his interests a number of princes and prelates; he might hope to sow discord in the council, since many were still too much entangled in the old church system, to feel at liberty to approve any sterner measures against the pope. Not only were the Italians of this temper, or else inclined to the interest of the pope in other ways, but a breach was already threatening to take place betwixt the freer party, which consisted of the Germans and the English, and at whose head was the emperor, and the French deputies on the other side. But this division was fortunately prevented by the exertions of the emperor. Thus the pope struggled every way against the above proposition, as if by following it he would compromise his dignity. He proposed to make the journey himself to Nice for the purpose of treating with Pope Benedict. But taught by the experience which they had had of Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII., the council had no confidence in the sincerity of this proposal, and feared that the pope, having once got away from Constance, would endeavour to effect a dissolution of the council. In vain had the pope endeavoured to soften the heart of the emperor Sigismond, in whom the more liberal party ever found their strongest support, by the present of the golden rose, consecrated on Palm Sunday, a mark of honour with which princes were seldom gratified by the popes; in vain did he pretend that the climate of Constance did not agree with his health, as an excuse for leaving that city, to be followed by attempts to break up the council; the emperor pointed out to him the unsatisfactory character of these pretences, and offered him any more agreeable spot which he might choose for a residence in the vicinity of Constance. Already rumours were afloat about the pope's designs to get away from Constance, and secret directions given to those having custody of the gates, not to allow him to escape. The pope contradicted all such rumours before the emperor himself. Meanwhile, Duke Frederic of Austria, according to the plan agreed on with the pope, came on the 20th of March to Constance, and while he was diverting the public attention by a magnificent tournament on the next following days, Pope John escaped in the darkness of the evening, disguised as a groom, and fled to Schaffhausen.

Balthazar Cossa, whose conscience seems to have been completely blunted, could now, under the protection of Duke Frederic, and at a distance from the council, breathe more freely: he could now more easily indulge the hope that he should yet succeed in sowing discord among the prelates of the council, and effect its dissolution, as well-disposed persons of that time feared he might do. He put forth from Schaffhausen letters in justification of the course he had taken, full of holy pretensions. Sometimes he justified his flight by pleading danger to his health from the unfavourable climate of Constance, compelling him to take this course; sometimes he complains of the emperor, as hindering the free action of the council, putting restrictions on the pope himself, and threatening him. He used in justifying his conduct the words which we have already cited, words so customary in the diplomatic style of hypocrisy, "It was a fear such as might overcome even a steadfast man." He summoned the cardinals and papal officials to meet him at Schaffhausen on pain of the ban. Many actually complied with the summons. They travelled backwards and forwards between the council and the pope, executing the pope's secret commissions; and they succeeded in stirring up contention in the council. Many began already to say, No pope, no council, and the council seemed disposed to remove to some other spot. Already the worst was to be feared. The canonical priest, Zacharias of Urie, a native of Constance, and the historian of the council, who wrote at this moment, makes the complaining church express her fears, that, as at Pisa, the schism, instead of being healed, was multiplied, so from the council of Constance would result an increase rather than a cure of the evil. The pope would succeed, under the protection of Duke Frederic, in escaping to Bologna; he would establish his authority as pope in Italy; the council would choose a new one; neither Gregory nor Benedict would resign; and then there would be four popes at once.[1] But by the constancy of the independent members of the French, German, and English nations, by the vigorous measures of the emperor Sigismond and his co-operation with Chancellor Gerson, who was even then called the soul of the council (anima concilii), it was so managed,

[1] V. d. Hardt. tom. i. p. 179 sq.

that the infamous man, who still called himself pope, and to whose selfish interests many lent their support, did not succeed in carrying out his maxim, *Divide et impera.*

Gerson, in compliance with the request of the University of Paris, held, before the assembled council, on the 23d of March, a grave discourse in exposition of the new and freer system of ecclesiastical law, boldly setting forth the principles already propounded by him, and on the recognition of which, he believed, all independent action of the council must be based. In this discourse, he defines the idea of a general council as follows:[1] "It is an assemblage of all orders of the catholic church convoked by legitimate authority, excluding no person, whoever he may be, that demands to be heard, and for the purpose of deliberating and determining in a wholesome manner on all matters relating to the needful guidance of the church in faith and manners." He proceeds to say, "If the church or general council decrees anything relating to the guidance of the church, the pope is not so exalted even above positive law, as to be authorized arbitrarily to annul such decrees, in the way and in the sense in which they were decreed. Although a general council cannot annul the pope's plenitude of power, conferred on him by Christ in a supernatural way, still it may modify the use of that power by determinate laws, and by confining it within a certain range for the edification of the church, with reference to which the papal power, as well as all other authority entrusted to man, was instituted. And this is the ultimate basis of all church reformation. A church assembly may be convoked in many cases without the express sanction and the express proposal of the pope, though he may have been lawfully elected and still living. One case is when he is accused and challenged to hear the church, according to the direction of Christ; and he obstinately refuses to call a meeting of the church. Another case is, when important affairs are to be deliberated upon in a general assembly and the pope declines to convoke it. Another case, when it has already been determined by one general council that another shall be held at a certain time; and the last case, whenever a lawful doubt exists with regard to the pretensions of several individuals

[1] Gersonis orat. in v. d. Hardt. tom. ii. p. 272.

contending with each other for the papal office. The authority of this council is such, that whoever seeks knowingly, in a direct or indirect manner, to dissolve it and destroy its authority, or to remove it to another place, or to set up another council in opposition to it, subjects himself to the suspicion of creating a schism, or a heresy." Such an one may be accused before the council, and must defend himself before the same, to whatever order he may belong. That the council is greater than the pope, is evident from the words of Christ, that the offending brother should be accused before the church, a law which admits of no exception. Now then, if the pope gives occasion of scandal to the whole church, and perseveres in it to the great injury of faith and good manners, ought he not to be punished according to that law?[1]

This discourse was communicated to the cardinals by the emperor Sigismond, at first in manuscript; but such as were governed by the spirit of the party, and devoted to the papal interest, could of course only condemn the principles here expressed. They declined being present at the time the discourse was delivered, lest by so doing they might seem to give countenance to the principles set forth in it. The Patriarch, John of Antioch, ventured to lay down positions, standing in direct contradiction to those principles. He was an advocate for unconditional papal absolutism. From the fact that Christ had given to Peter the power of the Keys, he inferred that, in the pope, as successor of the Apostle Peter, resides all plenitude of ecclesiastical power; all authority of the church and of a general council could only proceed from him; the *council* therefore was subject to him, not *he* to the council; without him no council could subsist; he was responsible to none other than the Lord; and though he plunged multitudes of souls into hell, no one could call him to account.[2] It is easy to see what might be expected from the advocates of such a bent: and such principles, it must be confessed, were required, in order to defend such a pope as Balthazar Cossa. Cardinal d'Ailly called the patriarch to account on the spot, for maintaining such positions: as he also refuted them afterwards in a book. The patriarch, beset on all hands, excused himself

1 P. 278. Tom. ii. p. 297; tom. iv. p. 66.

by saying, that he had expressed these views, not as assertions, but by way of disputation.

After much controversy between the cardinals devoted to the papal interest and system, and the liberal men in the council, on whose side stood the emperor Sigismond, it was finally brought about that, in the fourth session of the council, on the 30th of March, the principles expressed by chancellor Gerson were proclaimed in the name of the whole council. This notable session, constituting an epoch in the proceedings of the council, expressed the following principles, to wit:[1]—*First*, that this council lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, and representing the catholic church militant, has received its authority directly from Christ, which every one, to whatever order he may belong, even though it be the papal, is bound to obey in whatever relates to faith and to the extermination of schism. *Secondly*, that Pope John is not authorized to remove the Roman court and its officials to another place. This canon, as it was drawn up in the assembly of the nations, had however attached to it an important addition—"in all things relating to the reformation of the church in its head and members." But against this clause, as also against many other points at variance with the hitherto prevailing system of the church constitution, the cardinals had protested; and the cardinal Francis a Zabarellis, bishop of Florence, commonly known under the name of the "Florentine cardinal," otherwise a man rather disposed to favour reform, had taken the liberty to omit this clause in the proclamation of the canon.[2] With this, however, the council was not at all satisfied; and it was carried, in spite of all protestations on the part of all the cardinals, that the bishop of Posen should, in the fifth session on the 6th of April, read this decree in its unabbreviated form. Meantime the cardinals, owing to the connection known to exist between several of them and the worthless John, and owing to their protests against the freer proceedings of the council, were rendering themselves, every day, more suspected and more hated. In this

1 Em. a Schelstrate tractat. de sensu et auctoritate decretorum Constant. concilii sess. quarta et quinta circa potestatem ecclesiasticam, cum actis et gestos ad illa spectant, Romae 1686, p. 226.

2 Thus Gobelinus Persona, who was present at the council, reports. Cosmodrom in Meibom. rer. germ. tom. i., Helmaestadii 1688, p. 339; also v. d. Hardt. tom. iv., pp. 87, 88.

struggle of parties at the council, was manifested a contrariety of views, which did not augur any favourable issue. One overture, handed in to the council by a prelate, and which certainly was based on some foundation of truth, deserves notice. He proposed, that in all transactions relating to the reformation of the church in its head and members, the cardinals should not be allowed to participate, inasmuch as they were a party concerned, and therefore could not be judges. The cardinals, whose duty it was to elect as pope the best man, or at least one not altogether bad, having knowingly elected so abominable a man, and by this abuse of their power given so great scandal to the whole church, had by so doing rendered themselves unworthy of participating in the election of a pope; they deserved other punishments, but for these reasons should not be allowed to share in these transactions of the council. It was, moreover, alleged against them, as a reason for excluding them from these transactions, that they had rendered themselves liable to suspicion by the fact that several of them had followed the pope in his scandalous flight, whereby he had given offence to the whole church; that they had asserted, on their return, that a council without a pope was no council, but only a conciliabulum; that so long as the pope was not deprived of his authority, or this authority was not suspended, no man, however mighty, however endowed with spiritual gifts, nor the council even, could effect a reformation; because Pope John would always find men ready to stand up for him, ready to be made rich by him; would always find purchasers of dignities, and therefore means to replenish his exchequer.[1] At this time appeared before the assembled council a messenger from the University of Paris, the Benedictine Gentianus, and delivered a violent discourse against the pope and the cardinals.[2] He complained that through the papal party the business before the council was delayed to the injury of the church. Ever since the beginning of November, the transactions had been strangely retarded by the pope and the cardinals, by many unprofitable transactions, until the 1st of March, on which day the pope had laid before the council a form of abdication. But when invited to nominate commissioners with full powers to carry, in his name,

1 Gobelin. p. 340. 2 V. d. Hardt. tom. ii. p. 180 sq.

this abdication into effect, he had constantly declined; and the cardinals, who followed him in this, had delayed matters by continually proposing amendments, to the great hazard of their souls, and to the great injury of this council. Then the pope had paid no regard to his oath, had fled by night in disguise, for the purpose of breaking up the council, abandoning everything for which it was his duty to sacrifice himself. But a great part of the cardinals had followed the pope, hoping to go to Italy or to some other agreeable spot. But as they had not succeeded in their designs, some of them, out of shame, had come back; others, as they had disgraced themselves, remained behind in Schaffhausen, lest a worse thing might befal them. Then, the cardinals had opened negotiations with the council, designed to retard its proceedings by mere talk. As an example of their intrigues, he states that cardinal Francis Zabarella had been bold enough to proclaim that decree respecting the supreme authority of the council, in a mutilated form; taking upon himself the liberty of thus trifling with the council. Men who thought themselves entitled to take such liberties as these, deserved no longer to be admitted to the deliberations. What sort of people these cardinals were, had been shown by their election of Pope John. They had sworn to choose the best man; but they had still chosen that John, whom they well knew at the time was a tyrant in disposition, an assassin, a man guilty of simony, and stained with other crimes. If a person like this was the best man among them, what sort of men were they themselves? The present evils had grown out of those earlier ones. The pope and the cardinals and their faction sought daily, by all they did, to bring it about that this council, exhausted by excessive labour and expense, should be compelled to break up. They ought no longer, then, to be trusted; but all fellowship with them should be withdrawn by those who would not perish with them in their sins. They ought no longer to be trusted, for they trifled with the council. Who, indeed, had ever given greater scandal to the church, than this Pope John and his friends, with their retainers? those traffickers who, in so unheard-of a manner, had higgled away, in bargains, as they would swine in the market, bishoprics, abbacies, canonicates, and parish-churches. In fact, the bulls were drawn up, not in the apostolical chancery, but in

the counting-houses of bankers or merchants, among the Florentines. Christ drove the sellers and buyers out of the temple; the pope and his adherents had brought them into the temple, and caused their tables to be set up there. Let the council, therefore, in order to bring to nought these deceptive arts, proceed undisturbed in their decrees, and make use of the power which God had given them. Let them but approve themselves as *constant* men in *Constance*[1]—so he concluded—and the Lord would give them the victory, and crush Satan under their feet.[2]

But such voices could have no other effect than to lead the cardinals to maintain their rights with so much the more decision, and to stand up for the prerogative of the Roman church, without which nothing could be done. It was only with great difficulty that a breach could be prevented between the two stiffly-opposed parties. The council, in strict conformity to the principles which had been announced, acted as the highest independent tribunal of the church. The pope, flying this way and that, addressed to the council extravagant demands, with which they could not properly comply, as the price of his abdication, and so spun out the negotiations. They finally resolved, therefore, to take the last decisive step, without paying any attention to the protests of those cardinals who were devoted to the pope. The pope's trial was made the order of the day, and in the seventh session, on the second of May, a citation was issued for him to appear before the council.

Duke Frederic of Austria had, in the meantime, been compelled by the emperor Sigismond to surrender into his hands the person of Pope John, and he was conveyed to Ratolfszell, a few miles from Constance, and there held in close confinement. The council had set forward the acts of the process—the witnesses were heard. On account of the heavy charges brought against him, he was first, in the session of the 14th of May, suspended from all spiritual offices; and then, in the eleventh session, on the 29th of May, was pronounced upon him the solemn sentence of deposition. Among other charges brought against him was one[3] that he stubbornly denied the immortality

1 A play on words: Si in Constantia constantes fueritis.

2 V. d. Hardt. tom. ii. p. 284.

3 Gobelin. Cosmodr. aet. vi. l. l. p. 341.

of the soul. It is indeed by no means improbable that a dead faith, or superstition sufficient to hush an accusing conscience by outward modes of expunging sin, may accompany a life as stained with crimes as was that of Balthazar Cossa; but still the conduct of this awfully wicked man becomes more explicable to us on the supposition of a decided and conscious infidelity. The council, in pronouncing upon him the sentence of deposition on account of his ignominious flight from Constance, on account of his perjury, of the scandal he had given to the church, of his promoting schism, still reserved to itself the right of proceeding against him on account of his other transgressions, with greater or less severity, as might seem good to the assembled fathers.[1] On the next day this sentence, passed by the council, was shown to Balthazar Cossa, in his prison at Ratolfszell. He testified repentance for his former life, calmly laid off the papal insignia, and handed them over to the deputies, and declared that, from the time he had put them on, he had not enjoyed one quiet day. Balthazar Cossa was then removed to the castle of Gottleben, not far distant from Constance, and given over to the custody of the palsgrave Louis of Bavaria.

By the deposition of Balthazar Cossa, one important obstacle in the way of restoring peace to the church was removed. Negotiations were now opened with the other two popes, Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII. The council had uniformly, in compliance with the advice of its wiser members, followed the principle of not allowing itself, in relations so new and extraordinary, to be governed by the letter of the hitherto prevailing laws; but to proceed with freedom, as the greatest good of the church required. So they acted in the present case. They were ready to give way in everything, provided only the schism could be utterly exterminated, and unity restored to the church. With Gregory XII. this course succeeded. It having been intimated to him that he might convoke the council anew and then recognize it, he did so, and then gave in the desired abdication, before the council, by his delegate Malatesta. Benedict XIII. was, to be sure, more obstinate; and nothing could be done with him. But by far the greatest part of the Spanish nation, which

1 V. d. Hardt. tom. iv. p. 281.

had thus far been devoted to his person, now deserted him and recognized the council. Thus in the year 1417, they had happily resolved one of their problems, and restored unity to the church. It was at present a council almost unanimously recognized by all the nations of Western Christendom, and the deputies of the Spanish nation now added themselves to it, so that from this time it consisted of five nations. But two problems now remained to be resolved: the long-desired reformation in the head and members, and the choice of a universally-acknowledged pope. The last was not a matter of very great difficulty, provided the form of papal election could be so arranged that all foreign and disturbing influences could be kept out of the way, and the chief influence in the selection could be secured to the better and wiser members of the council. Neither did so much depend on the person of the pope, provided the general guidance of the church were better ordered, provided that limits were set to all abuse of the papal authority, all arbitrary proceedings of the supreme pontiff, by means of an ecclesiastical legislation; provided a higher tribunal could be instituted, before which even popes might be arraigned in case they abused their power. Much more difficult was the resolution of the first problem; for this could never be carried out in a thorough manner, without conflicting with the selfish interests of many corporations and individuals. And particularly if papal authority should be restored, this might easily succeed, as at Pisa, in frustrating any thorough-going reformation of the church.

Already, in the month of August of the year 1415, a committee from the cardinals and deputies of the nations,—a collegium reformatorium,—had been appointed to consult on the affairs connected with the reformation of the church; and this committee had continued its deliberations. Many propositions of a more liberal stamp had been discussed and settled respecting the improvement of the church constitution, the extermination of many abuses, ecclesiastical extortions, the matters of penance and indulgence, free church elections, the veneration of relics and of saints, the control of papal authority. Solemn processions of various kinds had been appointed for the purpose of imploring the divine blessing on the reformation of the church. But, it must be confessed, the corruption of manners which reigned in

Constance during the meeting of the council; the multitude of prostitutes, who had found their way into that city; the bad example which so many set; simony which was practised during the very acts of reform; all this furnished no very promising augury of a successful result. And even while the business of the council was proceeding, serious men stood forth, and spoke plainly to the assembled prelates, on the open contradiction between their lives and the promise of a church reformation. We may notice here, in particular, discourses preached by the Franciscan Bernard Baptisatus (Baptisé) during the Deliberations on these matters in the year 1417. He says:[1] "The masses and processions and other things we busy ourselves with, have little or no value in the sight of God, through the fault of many Pharisees, who come here and pray to God in the temple." In all this he saw no true penitence, no devout prayer. "The prelates, alas!" says he, "have come to such extreme pride, that they hardly consider the people worthy of praying to God for the same things; they hardly can join them in imploring the divine grace or in singing the *Veni Creator spiritus*. He then distinguishes different classes of Pharisees assembled at the council—graduates, who never attended mass, sermons, or processions; holders of benefices, also parish priests, lazy, immersed in the business of the world, without devotion; men who served not God, but lived after the flesh. A second class were those who visited the Lord's temple, but whilst there, whispered falsehoods, laughed and made fun, slept, or carried on indecent conversation. A third class were those who came to church with a long train of attendants, standing in the way of the processions, and staring about on all sides. He mentions, as a fourth class, those who made a trade of ecclesiastical things. They bought or sold. Such simony, he affirms, could not be extinguished by sermons and tracts, but only by the execution of the law; the persons guilty of it should meet with condign punishment. The fifth class consisted of those who busied themselves with science, but not science relating to divine things, but with the study of the poets, of worldly philosophy, and especially of jurisprudence. He styles the Roman court—

1 V. d. Hardt. tom. i. p. 881.

of which it was said, it cared nothing for the sheep but only for the wool—not a divine court, but a court of devils. He hints that it had been revealed to one of the council, that unless simony should from henceforth be exterminated from the church, and the tyranny in it cast down, a dreadful persecution would shortly start up against the clergy, such as had never been before. On the degeneracy of the clergy he uses the strong language that they had already almost wholly gone over to the devil. Then addressing himself to those who had to elect the new pope, he says: "Be you no Pharisees! Suffer not yourselves to be bribed by money in this election, as was done before.[1] Suffer not yourselves to be misled by ignorance, to be disturbed by fear, to be turned aside by partiality for any one."

Everything now depended on the question whether the election of a pope or the reformation of the church should be the first thing to be looked after. This must have been well understood by all who had at heart the best good of the church, all the unprejudiced, all who were not bribed by some particular interest. Let us hear how the enlightened Nicholas of Clemangis,—who, having now retired from the din of the world, busied himself in silence with the study of the bible, and, remote from the passions which agitated others, formed his opinion from the experience of the past,—how this man contemplated the then situation of the council of Constance. Writing about the council to his friend, Nicholas de Baya,[2] he says: "What are we clergymen to do amid so many evils that affect us, and the still greater ones that threaten us, except to arm ourselves with the invincible shield of patience, and with the deepest contrition of our souls have recourse to the weapons of our warfare, which are tears and prayers? Had the church zealously and in a manner worthy of her, long ago, betaken herself to these weapons, she would have secured the alleviation of her own troubles, and thus of many others which affect the whole world. But how is she to sorrow over others' evils, if she cannot weep over her own which are so grievous and deep-rooted? How is she to help others, if she is too feeble to help herself, or so careless as to neglect to do it?" The first and most important thing of all, he says, is to find out

1 Doubtless an allusion to the choice of Balthazar Cossa.

2 Ep. 102, p. 290 sq.

the cause of the distemper: It is the anger of God, which men have drawn upon themselves. He then proceeds: "If we would labour, then, to any effect for the healing of these wounds, we must proceed in this council in a very different way from what has hitherto been done; and as I hear is done by the majority of ours who are still disposed to go to this council, not so much to seek peace for the church as to carry on the business of soliciting benefices for themselves. For I understand that some are departing with huge rolls of petitions, others with recommendatory letters from their princes, others, and especially the bishops, with a view to maintain their rights of collation and of patronage. Thus nearly all go to the council to seek their own, and but very few to promote whatever makes for peace and for the cause of Christ; when, however, the truth is, as we have been taught by the experience of so long a time, that those are only means for keeping up and perpetuating the schism. Believe me, such persons ought never to have been selected for this business, persons of whom it is to be expected, that they will do more by their covetousness to perplex the cause, than they can do by any zeal for peace to promote it in any way; but we should have chosen men who were especially free from ambition, and inspired with zeal for peace and church unity from heartfelt love, who would not do fawning homage to popes for the sake of gain, would not be slaves to party zeal, but seek to form alliances for the promotion of a wholesome concord, and not their own private ends. For who could hope that the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace could ever be restored amidst so much ambition, amidst such corrupting flattery, so many quarrels growing out of party zeal? The Holy Ghost, the Author and mediator of peace, is not wont to be called down by such arts. Peace comes with the Holy Spirit to those who seek it in guileless love, not with the prompting of carnal inclinations. For although the majority may differ from one another in their wishes and votes, as usually happens in councils, yet all must agree in love, that is, all must strive, out of charity, for concord. Those who do not so, deserve not to assist in counsels for peace, which they are wont to destroy more than to promote. Those who from a love without guile seek for concord, do not defend their opinions with proud and pertinacious passion; do not with self-glory rank themselves above others in

understanding and wisdom; do not seek diligently their own gain, their own glory and promotion. Such the Holy Spirit visits, such he assists, such he enlightens. Such, enlightened from above, see what is right, what is good, what is to be followed, what is to be avoided, in affairs; which others, blinded by the dust of their passions, are not wont to see. For the anointing of the Holy Ghost teaches them all things, and inspires them by secret influences with all that is profitable and healthful." In order to participate in this guidance of the Holy Spirit—he says—those who would assist at the council must give themselves to true repentance, and employ every means of grace, to purify their souls from sin, and render them fitter temples for the Holy Spirit. If he who is preparing for fellowship with Christ in the communion, betakes himself earnestly and in every way to acts of penitence, how should not he who would prepare his soul for the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, be solicitous above all things to have it cleansed and placed in suitable order for such a resident. "Of what use"—says he—"are masses, processions, and public invocations of the Holy Spirit, if the dwelling of the heart be not prepared for his reception? What is it to invoke the grace of the Holy Spirit with a stupified and polluted conscience, but to invite him with the lips, and exclude him by the manners? God regards not the fine sounding voice, but the well ordered soul,—not the sweet gracefulness of harmony, but purity of conscience." And he held it necessary that not only those who personally attended the council, but all who had at heart the good of the church, should participate in this work of preparation. "In order to pray rightly for this laudable union, not only should this preparation of the soul be made by those that attend the council, but the prelates should stir up the catholic people everywhere to take the same course." And according to the ancient custom of the fathers, they should appoint fasts and other penitential exercises for the people; and when they are thus, so far as human frailty allows, more generally purified from the stains of sin, the prelates should appoint solemn processions to appease the divine anger, which the clergy should attend, with fasting and weeping, in sackcloth and ashes, setting an example to others, and the whole community should accompany them with their prayers. During the whole sitting of the council should processions be

made; and the princes should join in them, not in princely state, but in simple and humble garb, or in the habiliments of mourning, as we read concerning the king of Nineveh. And all catholic kings should for once lay aside their mutual enmities, and attend the council in person, except those who might have reasonable excuse for absence. First, because by their authority, the parties might be more easily induced to engage heartily in the business of establishing peace, and would stand in far greater awe of them than they did of the prelates and cardinals; next, because their presence would contribute to give the council a more perfect feeling of security and ease. And should there be some persons present inclined to make difficulty and disturbance, they could not so easily carry their purpose into effect. In case these things were done, he saw some prospect of a new and more glorious condition of the church through a reformation in its head and members.

Thus wrote Clemangis near the beginning of the council. But, after having watched from a distance its doings for a period of more than two years, he could not but perceive how very far short of his demands the council had fallen; and his anxiety about the final issue could not but be immeasurably increased. He writes to the members of the council;[1] "Men assembled for the express purpose of establishing peace on a sure foundation for the christian people, ought first to strive after peace with God for themselves, and then seek to preserve among each other the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, that Satan may not stir up new divisions among those who are contending for the repose and peace of God's people. Satan had already, as he was informed, tried by various devices to spread among them his noxious poison, and to divert them by many a cunning trick and delusion from their holy purpose, sometimes by drawing them away from the principal matter and plunging them into other strife-begetting questions, sometimes by impelling them to new elections through the restless uneasiness of the ambitious, sometimes by throwing in their way new difficulties growing out of one cause and another. And probably, this father of lies and of all wickedness would never be quiet, but would seek to ruin

1 Ep. 112 ad concilium generale, p. 311.

the cause by new devices, so long as they could avail anything. But it was their business, amid all these difficulties and hindrances, to defeat his malice by their wisdom; and they must confine all their solicitude to the great object, if their renowned assembly, convoked for the re-establishment of peace, was not to break up without accomplishing its purpose. For should such a thing happen, which God forefend! then farewell to the unity of the church; about the re-establishment of which such great hopes had been excited. Men would utterly despair of it; and the schism among the Latins themselves would, like that between the Latin and the Greek churches, become an incurable one. Let them not desist, however, from their purpose, since God had already done so much for it, since by their success in removing two of the contending popes out of the way, they had peace, as it were, already in their hands. Let them not be moved by the violent demands of some, to proceed prematurely to the election of a new pope; they could not, in the present circumstances, do a worse thing for the church. Let them not imitate the actions of those, who with good reason were blamed by them. Those over-hasty elections had, in fact, brought ruin on the church; they had caused the schism to strike still deeper root, and plunged the church into those coils out of which it could not possibly be extricated, if the council should again proceed, before establishing the unity of the church on a safe foundation, to a new papal election. He warns them against the influence of ambitious men, who were seeking nothing but their own benefit; of whom the world and the church were so full, that in comparison to them, the rest were but few. Men had hitherto suffered themselves to be controlled too much by such persons, had bestowed too much attention on the mere distribution of benefices. Let them from the example of the past, then, take warning with regard to the future. The choice of a pope should be the very last thing of all. He proposes that the council in the meantime should make an ordinance empowering the bishops to attend to the distribution of the benefices. He believes that it would on the whole have been much better for the Roman church, if it had not taken all this into its own hands, had not thus been diverted from the repose of meditation, and entangled in so much secular business. They should not let themselves be drawn aside by these minor

affairs from the one great business. Nay, it were better that the benefices should remain for a longer time vacant, than that the looking after the greatest good of the entire church should thereby fall into neglect. There was not one way only, there were various methods by which the heavenly physician could heal the distempers of the church; and he lets them be discovered by those who earnestly seek them: opens to those who humbly knock. If the objects attempted in one way did not succeed, if they could not bring things themselves to harmonize with their plans and purposes, they ought, rather than give up, to accommodate themselves to circumstances: as a wise man says, "If you cannot do as you will, then you should do as you can." It was affirmed by many that one thing had been settled—which, however, he would not believe—namely, that neither of the three rival popes should be elected again. Were they certain, then, upon whom the lot of the Holy Ghost would fall, or was it right to think of setting a limit or imposing a law on the Holy Ghost, who alone could guide the choice, and govern the souls of men? What was the meaning of limiting the Holy Ghost by man's arbitrary will, except to exclude him entirely? If the saying of Paul was irrefragable, that where the spirit is, there is liberty, how could we hope that the spirit would be there, where liberty was not? Might it not possibly be the case, might not that case perhaps be just at hand, that unless they elected one of these individuals, they could not restore concord? In such a case, any one surely could easily see, what course would be best, whether to elect such a person, or to go home without peace. He calls God to witness, that he did not say this out of favour to any man, but by reason of his sympathy with the suffering church. Assuredly Clemangis was right in bringing the experiences of the past as a warning for the council; certainly he was right in exhorting them against the over-hasty choice of a pope, in warning them against the plans of self-willed cunning, in inviting them to shape their course according to circumstances; but with all the true things which he says in this letter, it is still easy to understand that, although he might not be willing to confess it himself, his old inclination in favour of Benedict XIII. governed him; and he would have gladly persuaded the council to acknowledge him unanimously as pope, which, however, would hardly have been the suitable means

then, either for restoring union to the church or for its reformation.[1]

The emperor Sigismond had the Germans, English, and French on his side, when at the beginning he insisted that the reformation should precede the election of the pope. But the Italians and Spaniards were too strongly devoted to the old system to be able to reconcile it with their sense of propriety, that a council should any longer subsist without a pope. The cardinals were bound together by the esprit du corps, with the exception of two who agreed with the emperor. They feared that too many things would turn up contrary to their own interest from the freer tendencies of the council. They exerted an influence, also, on the other nations. The French nation, on whom d'Ailly had a great influence, were gained over to the project of hastening the papal election. The emperor found himself left alone with the English and Germans. The German Doctor, who had charge of the external affairs of the council, and served under the palsgrave, describes, in his simple and honest German style, the strong apprehensions which were felt that the reformation would be frustrated, if the election of a pope should be pushed forward first.[2] The emperor and the party attached to him were called upon from many quarters to be careful not to depart from their plan. We may notice the speech of Stephen of Prague, probably Stephen Paletz, that fierce enemy of Huss, the man in whose eyes it was a damnable heresy to assert that the church could subsist without a visible head. Yet even he felt himself constrained to demand before all things else the reformation of the church. Undoubtedly he had sufficiently experienced amidst the commotions in Bohemia, that it was nothing else but the crying abuses in the church that had operated most powerfully in calling forth those reactions. He invited the council before

1 This interest in favour of Benedict is evidenced also, when in the 132d letter ad Reginaldum, p. 336, he traces the evils in France especially to the circumstance, that the legitimate pope Benedict had been treated so abusively.

2 "But the Anglici and Germani wanted to have the reformation done before the election. And if that were to be done when the choice was made, every one would ride home, as soon as he had done up his own business; and so the reformation would never take place. And moreover, when a pope was chosen, if the thing pleased him, he would set about it; if it did not please him, he would not have it. The whole matter, then, depended on the pope; and so they let the matter hang; and not a thought more was had about it." V. d. Hardt. tom. iv. p. 1397.

they elected a pope to proceed to the suppression of heresies, a business which it was competent to, even without a pope, as it was more than the pope and the cardinals, and by the guidance of the Holy Ghost infallible in matters of faith.[1] Speaking of the reformation needed in the mode of appointing to church offices, he says: "By reason of the many advantages, the wealth and honour connected with ecclesiastical offices, the foolish and the wise, the young and the old, the bad and the good, the learned and the unlearned, strive to obtain them. All seek, either by good means or by bad, to attain to the fat spiritual prebends. They are ready to move heaven and earth, expose themselves to great dangers and great hardships, such that if they endured the same for God's sake, they would win the crown of martyrdom; they will degrade themselves to the filth of kitchens, and to the menial service of grooms, for the sake of getting promoted to spiritual benefices." We may call to mind the agreement between this account and the language already cited of Chancellor Gerson, and of Henry of Hessia. He invites the prelates of the council in particular, now that they were approaching the end of their work of restoring peace to the church, to be on their guard against the devices of Satan, who was seeking to thwart this object, was now exciting so much the more division among them as his time was short. So we find a letter also from an unknown person, who, being a bishop of no diocese, calls himself a vagrant in the world,[2] pourtraying to the emperor the corruption of the church in all its orders, and urgently inviting him to forward the cause of reformation. So we find the archbishop of Genoa delivering a speech and exhorting the emperor to perseverance in promoting the work of reform.[3] But the most violent opposition to this course came from the part of the cardinals, who in the month of September presented two protests against the interference of the emperor and the efforts of the German party, against whom they tried to excite suspicion. They complain, that although the larger and sounder part of the

1 V. d. Hardt. tom. i. p. 833.

2 Ego enim Heinricus mobilis, episcopus nullius dioeceseos, vagorum vagus, licet minimus inter ceteros nostrae congregationis ministros ad hoc deputatus, legatus seu nuncius specialis, missus in universum orbem, omnia videns, veniens visitando limina beatorum Petri et Pauli, etc. V. d. Hardt. tom. i. p. 801.

3 Pilei, archiepiscopi Genuensis parænesis ibid. p. 812.

council, the French, Italian, and Spanish nations, and the cardinals, two excepted, were of one mind on the subject, the Germans pertinaciously offered resistance.[1] They labour to show, that the greatest danger grew out of the long continued vacancy of the papal chair. The council, by permitting this, was inflicting the greatest injury on its own credit. In many districts men were still undecided as to the stand which they meant to take in regard to this thing, and were waiting for the election, to see whether it would so turn out, that they could recognize the person to be elected as lawful pope. Already reports were in circulation about divisions in the council. Already men talked of some constraint under which it must labour.[2] It was to be feared, that if the election should be longer delayed, a new pope would be chosen at Rome, and find acknowledgment throughout all Italy. It was to be feared, that by some circumstance or other, the dissolution of the council—a thing no doubt which the cardinals themselves with their allies could do a great deal towards bringing about—might take place before any step had been taken towards the election of a pope: and how then could they ever succeed in having a universally recognized pope, when there was no pope to convoke a council? Thus these cardinals could never find it in their power to accept the principles of a freer church law; the old Roman church-system ever lay at the bottom of their creed. They complained that the Germans had left unanswered for three months their invitation that they should unite with themselves in deciding on the form of the papal election, which, to be sure, the Germans had done, but for the good reason, that the German party were for deferring everything else until the reformation of the church had been secured. They avowed that those who were ever standing in the way of the election of a pope, made themselves suspected of promoting the schism, inasmuch as the church, so long as it remained without

1 Tres nationes, Italiae videlicet, Galliae et Hispaniae, quae faciunt multo majorem et saniorem partem concilii, et ultra dicti domini cardinales illam acceptaverint caet. Schelstrat. p. 256.

2 Nec non etiam, quod quorundam, qui eidem concilio adhaeserunt, propter rumores discordiarum, et quasi impressionum, quas in eodum concilio fieri audiunt, fides jam de eodem concilio dicitur vacillare. Ibid. p. 257. We may probably understand here a malicious allusion to the pretended limiting influence of the emperor Sigismond.

a universally acknowledged head, was not restored as yet to its true unity. They washed their hands of all blame, should great dangers and mischiefs be found to spring out of this want of a universally acknowledged pope; they threw the responsibility of all this upon the Germans alone. They labour to show that the reasons given by the latter for postponing the election were no reasons at all. They themselves also and the other three nations shared with the Germans the interest which the latter expressed for the reformation of the church, as they had indeed also taken their part in the transactions on that subject; but there was nothing to hinder them, while proceeding to the election of a pope, from acting also at the same time on the matter of church reform. The most important thing in the reformation of the church was to provide, in the first place, that the church should have a universally acknowledged visible head; for the body without the head was a mutilated carcase. How could men speak of a *reformation* while this *deformation* still continued to exist? To the unity of the church belonged two conditions, the union of the members among themselves, and their union with the head. The first they had attained; the second was still wanting, and this, therefore, should be the first thing to be brought about. Already the people were uttering against the Germans such reproaches as these: "They were inclined to the heresy of the Hussites, to believe that the church had no need of a visible head. A card was handed about containing twelve points which required decision, among which were the following: Whether it was proper to say that, the apostolical chair being vacant, as all know it to be now, no new election was to be made; but that after such a vacancy, the church may remain, for a long and undefined time, without a head, and without any canonical arrangement relating to the form of the future election; whether this was contrary to divine law, contrary to Christ's direction with regard to his vicars and the successors of Peter? Whether it was heretical, or appeared at least to favour heresy, and particularly the Hussite heresy, condemned by this council, to say that the church could be better governed without a pope, than with his authority and that of the Roman church? Whether it was erroneous to assert, that it was a less

mischief for the church to be wholly without a head, than to be deprived of the reformation of the head? Whether to assert that the Roman and universal church could not be reformed in the right way without depriving her of the temporal goods with which she had been superfluously endowed by the princes, was not something erroneous and akin to the Hussite heresy?" In the propositions here thrown out, many of which very closely resemble what is to be found in the protest of the cardinals, we see manifested a disposition to find already in the Germans a spirit hostile to the secularization of the church, together with a fear that some attack might be made on the excessive wealth of the church by a council acting freely without a pope. In this suspicion and these complaints against the Germans lies a prophecy; although they were really *at this time* far from entertaining any such thoughts of a church revolution. Meantime Robert Hallam, bishop of Salisbury, one of the most free spirited members, and the most zealous for church reform, had died at the council. He had communicated, especially to the English nation, the free reformatory spirit. After his death, the English deputies were more easily drawn over to the other party. The Germans alone stood faithfully by the emperor Sigismond; but they singly could not carry the matter through without producing a schism in the council, and bringing about its dissolution. But the Germans before they gave in, published on the 14th September, 1417, in opposition to the protest of the cardinals already mentioned, that well known protest which so characteristically marks the German spirit, from which the great Reformation was destined one day to proceed: "Whereas, they had in these days been repeatedly called upon to send some from their body to deliberate about the election of a pope, which, in their opinion, is undertaken prematurely and unreasonably, as it was by their predecessors; and whereas, the German nation, among other nations, has been rather violently beset; a nation —so they characterize themselves—devoted to God, patient and humble, and yet by God's grace not without power, but including in itself, besides the imperial monarchy, eight illustrious kingdoms," etc. They then go on to notice the suspicions above mentioned, that they promoted schism, favoured the

heresy of Wicklif and Huss, and remark: "These false criminations and calumnies this nation has hitherto,[1] for the sake of peace and the preservation of concord, preferred patiently to endure, rather than by manifesting impatience and being zealous for their own honour, expose themselves to be charged by the other nations with creating discord among brethren." Far from them was it to think that the church could be governed without a pope, or that a longer vacancy of the papal chair was useful; yet they believed that such vacancy would, perhaps, be still more dangerous, where the guidance by a council did not exist as a matter of fact. And perhaps it had already been more dangerous, for the two years during which the council had so many opponents to contend with, so many kingdoms, which now had attached themselves to it. Therefore the danger at present seemed to them to be less. And since the preceding decline of the church was owing to the schism, therefore it was especially necessary, in order to guard against divisions for the future, to provide for the reformation of the head, and of the Roman court, on which future papal elections must moreover depend; and from this point these elections should be fixed and settled by the most sacred laws. The church from its commencement onward had been thus governed by the apostle Peter and the other apostles and their successors, those most devout shepherds, who cared not for money but for souls,[2] through a period of almost a thousand years; in a word, so long as heavenly interests were valued more highly than earthly; but it must be acknowledged as a painful fact, that for the last 150 years, or thereabouts, several popes with their courts had been devoted to the fleshly life, immersed in worldly pleasure, and thus they had sunk downward to what was still worse, had forgotten the things of heaven, had taken no concern whatever in the welfare of souls and things purely spiritual, but looked merely at what was subservient to gain, had usurped to themselves, by resorting to any means, the rights of other churches. The papal reservations, which spurned all laws, and which enabled them to determine

1 V. d. Hardt. tom. iv., p. 1419: Deo devotam, patientem et humilem nationem Germanicam, per dei gratiam non magis impotentem, sed praeter imperialem monarchiam octo regna inclyta continentem caet.

2 Devotissimos pastores, non pecuniarum, sed animarum. P. 1421.

the appointments to all ecclesiastical offices, are cited as an example. They had brought all tribunals under their own control; decided on all matters, even secular; dispensed unusual indulgences for money; and finally they had amassed such an amount of wealth, that many of them could enrich all their kinsmen, and some had even sought to make them princes. And hence, and especially owing to the neglect of prolonging general councils of reform, covetousness, which is called idolatry, paying court for spiritual dignities, heresy and simony, had spread far and wide. From these causes had sprung the most dangerous schisms, which some cardinals, of different and perhaps hostilely disposed nations, had in carnal temper promoted and cherished. Pomp and display had increased among the clergy. Hence the study of the sciences had declined; church structures and monasteries had fallen to decay; their landed property had remained uncultivated and uncared for; and their valuable moveable property had been squandered away. Only the rich, men versed in pecuniary affairs, the frivolous, the general vagrants, the ignorant, the vicious, and a few capable men, were, in utter contempt of the devout and learned, not only promoted, but in God's temple preferred above all others, as by an undeniable right of succession. Distinct prominence was given to the matter of indulgences as constituting the worst of these abuses;—the notion that sins could be estimated at a certain price and the pardon of them sold.[1] It was because the laity had seen such things done before their eyes, and had been so scandalized thereby, that they looked with contempt upon the once so highly esteemed order of the clergy, and regarded it as more an antichristian than a christian institution.[2] The German nation, it was said, had learned wisdom by the experience obtained at Pisa. It had seen how the expectation of a reformation of the church, excited by solemn promises and assurances, had been disappointed; how after the choice of two popes the evil only went on from worse to worse;

1 Sub colore appretiandarum chartarum, crimina delinquentium, aut gratia dispensationum, praecise secundum qualitatem suam, ut res profanae taxantur, abusiones manifeste nefandas committendo, indulgentias inconsuetas pro pecuniis largiendo. P. 1422.

2 Ecclesiasticum statum, quem ab olim devoto cultu reverebatur, nunc tanquam amplius riguisset, levipendat, ut et illum apud aliquos magis antichristianum quam christianum fore putet. P. 1423.

how vice and depravation of manners still worse than the schism now to be exterminated, had spread far and wide. They demanded that first of all, this corruption, as the plague which tainted the whole body of Christ, should be exterminated from the house of God, that the pope, as a pure and holy man, might be elected by pure and holy men.[1] They demanded, that whatever appertained to the above described degeneracy of the church, should be so removed, that the church might be governed for the future after the example of that more ancient church governance, by which she had been guided a hundred and fifty years before, and in conformity with the old ecclesiastical laws; but this after the removal of those abusive ordinances which had been invented to favour the Roman church. They conclude by saying: "It is sooner to be borne and more salutary, that the Roman church should remain vacant for a time, while the general council has the direction. It is to be wished that the papal chair should in the first place be carefully purged of its defilement, lest the future pope, even though the holiest man should be elected, might, if he sat in the midst of these abuses, become himself defiled."[2] The Germans then proceed to invite the fathers of the council, they adjure them by the duty of their high calling, and by the fear of God, to unite with the German nation for this end, that ere they proceed to the election of a pope, efficient decrees be published at a public session relating to everything needful in order to reformation; and that then, and not till then, they should proceed to the business of settling upon the right mode of electing a pope, and to the actual election, which would in this case prove to be an easy affair. The German nation protested before God, before the host of angels, and before the entire church, to the assembled council, that if they refused to proceed in the way required, it would not be the fault of that nation, but theirs, that the bride of Christ, the holy mother church, inseparable from her bridegroom, was not re-

[1] Ex ovili dominico tanquam infectivam putredinem, antequam pastor apostolicus mundatus, sanctus et justus, et per mundatos, sanctos et justos eligatur, praemundare, et domum dei ab inveteratis foetidis, mundandis maculis expiare. Pag. 1423.

[2] Expedire videtur omnino, pontificalem cathedram prius diligenter purgari, et Romanam ecclesiam decoris moribus illustrari, quam futurum praesulem, etiamsi sanctissimus eligatur, in istis abusionibus sedendo, commaculare. P. 1424.

stored to purity and freedom from all stain, and in being thus restored, brought back also to perfect union.[1]

Thus the German nation replied to that protest of the cardinals, a document by which, as appears evident from the tone of the declaration, they felt themselves wronged; and thus they flung back the charges thrown out against them. This was the last word spoken in behalf of reform. Even the emperor and the Germans were obliged to yield at last; as they saw that nothing could be done. It was still required, however, that the pope should bind himself, immediately after the election and previous to the coronation, to proceed, before undertaking any other business, to the work of reform.

When the question, however, came to be discussed, in what form the resolution containing this requirement should be drawn up, it was declared, in opposition to the Germans, that a pope once chosen could not be bound,—a premonition of the course which matters were to take.[2] Meanwhile a great deal was said on the subject of the church reform; but there was an evident conflict between the interests, principles, and wishes of the different nations. Yet one event transpired which was of great moment; in a certain sense it might be said to constitute an epoch and lay the foundation for a new church constitution. In the 39th session the following resolution was adopted: that the frequent appointment of general councils was a principal means of rooting out tares from the field, counteracting heresies and schisms, and promoting the reformation of the church. The neglect of holding such synods hitherto had occasioned much harm. It was therefore resolved that a general council should be held in five years, then in seven years, and from thenceforth every ten years. The pope should, a month before the conclusion of every general council, make known the place of the next council, to be selected with the concurrence of this whole assembly. He could, for weighty reasons, if the circumstances required it, anticipate the

1 Protestatur haec natio Germanica coram deo, tota curia coelesti, universali ecclesia et vobis, quod nisi feceritis praemissa modo et ordine supra dictis, quod non per eam, sed per vos stat, stetit et stabit, quominus sponsa Christi, sancta mater ecclesia, suo sponso inconvulsa, purior et immaculata reformetur, et reformata ad perfectam reducatur unitatem. P. 1424.

2 Schelstrat. p. 269.

time of convoking the general assembly, but should never pass beyond the terms above designated. Accordingly, it would amount to this: that always either a general council should be actually in session, or soon to be held. If for particular reasons, however, such as war or a siege, the place previously designated for the council should prove unsuitable, the pope, with the concurrence of the cardinals, or two-thirds of them, might select a new place, belonging to the same nation with the place first designated, unless the same hindrance existed in reference to the whole nation; and in this case, he might convoke the council in some other place contiguous to this nation. Yet all this should be made known a year before the opening of the council, that all might have it in their power to be present at the proper time. By carrying this law into effect, the pope's absolute power would, to be sure, have been destroyed; a limit would have been set to his arbitrary will; the execution of the papal authority would have been subjected to constant oversight. But it was easier to draw up such a law in words, than to reduce it to practice. How much was involved in bringing about such frequent meetings of a general council! While the contest was still going on between the Germans and the other nations on the question, In what way the pope should be bound to make arrangements for a reformation of the church, news came, that a man entitled to the highest veneration, the bishop of Winchester, uncle to the king of England, bound on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, had arrived at Ulm. He was called in to act as a peace-maker; and he succeeded in bringing about an agreement, on the 30th of October. It was settled that the council should draw up a decree to the effect that the pope to be elected should reform the church in its head and in the Roman court, according to justice, and as the good government of the church required, before the council was dissolved; moreover the following points were expressly settled: 1. Relative to the number, the quality, and the nation of the cardinals; 2. relative to the reformation of the apostolical see; 3. relative to the annates; 4. relative to the collation of benefices and gratifications in expectancy; 5. relative to the confirmation of church elections; 6. relative to affairs which were to be transacted and those which were not to be transacted in the Roman chancery; 7. relative to appeals to the Roman court; 8. relative

to the question for what causes and in what manner the pope might be corrected or deposed;[1] 9. relative to the extirpation of simony; 10. relative to dispensations; 11. relative to indulgences. It was determined that, after committees had been appointed for discussing and settling these matters, the rest might return home. The cardinals had now, therefore, secured their object—that the deliberation respecting the form of papal election should come first in order. Already had many of the freer voices, from the German nation as it seems, demanded that the cardinals should have no part in the papal election. We have seen, already, how their late choice of one of the most abandoned men had been turned against them. It was not without reason, therefore, that their influence was distrusted; but *they* had no intention to put up with this exclusion. One of them declared that a council without a pope had no right to alter the form of the papal election; that a pope chosen according to this altered form, would not be acknowledged as lawful pope. They finally agreed upon this: that six from each nation, together with the cardinals, should unite to form an electoral college, and that he who received two-thirds of the votes of these electors should be recognized as lawful pope.[2] Through the strife of the different nations, of whom each wanted to have a pope from its own body, another schism might easily have arisen. The Germans set the example of sacrificing their own wishes and interests to the good of the church, declaring themselves ready to give their votes for an Italian; they also prevailed on the English to yield. The French and Spaniards were refractory at first; but finally, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, on St Martin's day in November, they were prevailed upon to give place for the Holy Spirit as a spirit of concord; and on the same day, Cardinal Otto of Colonna was chosen pope, after the election had lasted three days. He called himself Martin the Fifth.

When it was found that the newly elected pope did not proceed so speedily as was desired to the work of reform, the French deputies betook themselves to the emperor, and begged him to press the matter with the pope; but Sigismond told them, that at an earlier day, while as yet there was no pope, it had

[1] Propter quae et quomodo Papa possit corrigi vel deponi. Schelstrat. p. 271.
[2] V. d. Hardt. tom. iv. p. 1452 sq.

been his duty to look after this matter; and when he had insisted that the reform should precede the pope's election, they had opposed him. Now they had a pope as they desired; and to *him*, therefore, they should go, *whose business it was* now.[1] When at length the subject of reformation again came up for deliberation, the Germans presented a draft from which we select the following remarkable points. The business related to the cases in which the pope might be corrected or deposed. It appeared to them that the pope could be punished and also deposed by a general council, not only for heresy, but also for notorious simony, as well in reference to the sacraments as to the bestowment of benefices, and for any other notorious transgression, whereby scandal was given to the church, if, when reminded of his fault in a lawful way, he proved to be incorrigible. Furthermore, that the excessive indulgences which had been granted during the time of the schism, and had extended to the pardon of *all* sins, should be wholly revoked.[2] Pope Martin subsequently drew up a plan of reform which by no means answered the expectations of the nations. In this plan some notice was taken of the two points just referred to, which had been brought up by the Germans. In reference to the *first*, it was observed, that it did not appear, and such was the judgment also of several of the nations, how anything new could be determined on that matter. In reference to the second, it was said the pope would take care for the future, that there should be no too lavish dispensation of indulgences, lest they might fall into contempt.[3] And those granted since the death of Gregory XI., together with such as had been granted for release from punishment and debt or full pardon of sin at certain places, he revoked and declared null and void. Then still greater advantages were gained to the papal interest by concordats with the several nations.

The last session of the council on the 22d of April of the year 1418, in which session the council was adjourned by the pope, was a scene of great agitation. Before the close, the

1 Gobelin. Pers. Cosm. p. 345.

2 Quod indulgentae exorbitantur concessae tempore schismatis, continentes remissionem omnium peccatorum, sint penitus revocandae. V. d. Hardt. tom. i. p 1010.

3 Cavebit dominus noster papa in futurum nimiam indulgentiarum effusionem, ne vilescant. Ibid. p. 1038.

envoys of the Poles and the Lithuanians appeared with a grievance. They had accused before the council a book of the Dominican, John of Falkenberg, who had been hired by the German order of knights to provoke a war of extermination against the newly converted Lithuanians and Poles, as containing hurtful errors of doctrine. This book had been examined and condemned. But the thing they demanded, that the pope should appoint a public session in which the sentence of condemnation should be proclaimed, they could not carry out, probably because the pope was restrained by political considerations. They appealed, therefore, from the pope to the next general council. But they were silenced by the pope on pain of excommunication; and Martin V. put forth, in the last consistory of the cardinals at Constance, a constitution, by which, in direct contradiction to the principle so distinctly laid down at Constance, he directed that no one should be allowed to dispute any decision of the pope in matters of faith, and to appeal from him to a general council.

This constitution of Pope Martin V. was the occasion which led Gerson, towards the end of the council of Constance in the year 1418, to compose a paper in which he defended anew the principles of freer church law expressed at Constance. He showed that by this constitution, the principle relating to the supreme authority of the general council proclaimed in that public session at Constance, had been overturned; and that inasmuch as it was by virtue of the same that John XXIII. had been deposed and Martin V. had been chosen pope, the legality of his own election, which rested on this principle, would be perilled. He found fault with this constitution, as contradicting the rule given by Christ himself, Matthew xviii., respecting appeal to the judgment of the church. He went on the principle that the pope was a man liable to sin and to error; his decision therefore could not be regarded as infallible. In proof he adduces the example of Peter, whose successors the popes were, and cites the fact that Peter had been corrected of a practical error by Paul; and maintained that a doctor of theology, as a successor of the apostle Paul in this regard, might in a sermon publicly correct

1 Tractatus, quomodo et an liceat in in causis fidei a summo pontifice appellar seu ejus judicium declinare. Oper. tom. ii. p. 303.

the pope. The decision of a bishop or of a pope, in matters of faith, should, in reference to the extent of the spiritual jurisdiction of either of these functionaries, bind only so far to obedience as that none should deliver anything to the contrary save where he might feel compelled to do so by the teachings of Holy Scripture, or the decisions of the church. Furthermore, he was of the opinion, that among the immediate attendants of the pope, there was often a much greater want of men stored with knowledge, well-experienced and grounded in pure doctrine, than at the universities, where the study of the Sacred Scriptures was more sedulously pursued. He maintained, that it was no less a duty to meet and confute those errors which were at variance with the commandments, Thou shalt not swear falsely, thou shalt do no murder, and which threatened the overturn of all public order, than to confute errors in doctrines of faith. Still Gerson somewhat modified these statements, out of respect to the authority of the pope, by adding, that the constitution of the pope might perhaps admit of another interpretation, and that the pope himself would best ward off such charges, by a decided condemnation of such practical errors.

At the council of Constance, the next general council was appointed to meet, five years later, at Pavia. Accordingly such a council was actually opened there, in the year 1423; but on account of the spread of the pestilence called the Black Death, it was dissolved and transferred to Siena. But at Siena, also, only a few sessions were held; and on the pretence that the small number of prelates assembled did not authorize the continuance of the council, in conformity with the determination of the council of Constance, the next meeting was appointed to be held seven years later, in the year 1431, at Basle. Pope Martin V. nominated already as legate to this council, and to preside over it, the cardinal Juliano Cesarini. At this important crisis he died, and left behind this weighty business for his successor Eugene IV. Cardinal Cesarini had also received from the late pope the commission, as his legate, to direct the proceedings undertaken against the Hussites in Bohemia, with a view to bring them back to union with the church. If we may credit his own words, the direction of the council of Basle which the pope had imposed on him, was regarded by him as a very unwel-

come task. In his letter to Eugene IV., hereafter to be mentioned, he thus expresses himself: "I believe the whole Roman court is aware, how irksome to me was that legation in reference to the council. At that time I had not a visitor to whom I did not express my regret at the appointment." He reminds the pope of what he had said to him personally on the subject when the latter was still cardinal. "Willingly as I went on the legation to Bohemia, as unwillingly did I undertake that other, on account of many things which I then dreaded as to what might possibly happen, and which I already begin to experience as having actually taken place."[1] From the circumstances of the times, the conflicting interests of the reformatory spirit everywhere rife and active, a spirit which, especially in a Swiss city, might break forth with more than ordinary violence, against the interest of papal absolutism, it was, doubtless, easy to foresee the recurrence of severe contests; and Julian might fear that he would become entangled in them. The business in Bohemia would be easier for him, where the whole was reduced to the simple point of a contest between an heretical tendency and the ruling church. While he was tarrying at Nuremberg he received the news of Martin's death and of the new government of Eugene. He now besought the new pope, by letter after letter, to release him from the commission given him by Pope Martin, and appoint some other person as president of the council. He then travelled further about in Germany, preaching the crusade against the Bohemians. After this he returned to Nuremberg, where he received from the pope his commission to repair to Basle, and take upon himself the charge of presiding over the council. As he heard, however, that only a few prelates had as yet arrived at Basle, and as his presence in Bohemia seemed to him of more importance, he adopted the expedient of appointing two ecclesiastics, John of Bilombar and John of Ragusio, as his representatives for the present to preside at the council, promising himself that, as soon as the Bohemian affair permitted, he would repair to Basle and take the presidency upon himself. Several causes, however, conspired, after he had

1 Propter multa quae tunc verebar posse accidere, quae jam experiri incipio. Epistola Juliani ad Eugenium IV. in operibus Aeneae Silvii, ed. Basil. 1571 pag. 64 sq.

formed this resolution, to induce him to alter his mind and to proceed immediately to Basle. The unhappy issue of the campaign in Bohemia, and the dangers that threatened the adjacent borders of Germany, created a wish for the most energetic measures to renew the war, and the council of Basle might furnish the best opportunity for bringing about a combined effort to promote this object. Furthermore, Cesarini had been led to observe, by the representations of the Bohemian nobles, that the Hussite affair could not be disposed of by violent measures, but that far more was to be hoped for from peaceful negotiations; but these also could be most conveniently managed by the general council of Basle. His subsequent journey through Germany served still more to convince the cardinal how necessary a general council was, to satisfy the constantly disappointed expectations of a reformation of the church, to reform the corrupt clergy who provoked the indignation of the laity more and more every day, and, by giving assurance of redress to the complaints of the people, to ward off the threatening danger of a revolt against the church of Germany. Julian himself, in the above mentioned letter from Basle addressed to pope Eugene, says on this point: "What impelled me to come here, is the false position and the licentiousness of the German clergy, owing to which the laity are exasperated beyond measure against the ecclesiastics. Wherefore it is very much to be feared, that if they do not reform, the laity will, after the manner of the Hussites, fall out with the whole body of the clergy, as is already openly threatened."[1]

Pope Eugene, however, soon altered his resolution. The recollections of the council of Constance may have filled him with apprehensions; and he gladly availed himself of such pretexts as he found at hand, to remove the council to a distance from a city which breathed an atmosphere of freedom, and which, from circumstances connected with the place, threatened to excite the same spirit in others. He alleged as reasons, that the number of prelates assembled was so small, while the time fixed for the opening of the council had already elapsed; that the disorders

[1] P. 66: Incitavit etiam me huc venire deformitas et dissolutio cleri Alemaniæ, ex qua laici supra modum irritantur adversus statum ecclesiasticum. Propter quod valde timendum est, nisi se emendent, ne laici more Hussitarum in totum clerum irruant, ut publice dicunt.

of war prevented the meeting of a greater number of prelates; that the contagion of the Hussite heresy had spread into those districts, and many citizens of Basle, infected with that spirit, were said to have threatened the clergy; that already, under the preceding pope, negotiations had been opened with the Greeks on the subject of union, and these were unwilling to visit so distant a city; that among several Italian cities, Bologna had already been selected by them; wherefore, in order to the furtherance of so weighty an affair, it was requisite that a council should be held at Bologna, and he promised that he himself would open that council in person. But two general councils could not sit at the same time, since they must interfere with each other. For these reasons the pope declared it necessary that the council of Basle should be dissolved, and appointed another, to meet in a year and half from that time, at Bologna. He gave Cardinal Julian full power to carry this decree into effect.[1]

But this scheme of the pope could not be carried into effect so easily. There had already arrived at Basle many free-minded men, especially from the lower order of clergy. Doctors of theology and of the canon law, among whom we may mention one who stood most prominently forth as representing the freer spirit at the council of Basle, who had expounded the principles of the freer ecclesiastical law in a work entitled *Concordantia catholica*, and who held a high rank in his times as a theologian, philosopher, and mathematician; Nicholas Krebs of Cuss in Trier, known by the name of Nicholas of Cusa, or Cancer Cusanus. One fact, however, especially worthy of notice—one striking token of the reformatory spirit, of the universal consciousness that an eventual reformation of the church had come to be a matter of urgent necessity—was this, that while on all other occasions the papal legates were wont to serve, in all respects, as the obedient instruments of the popes, it was from Cardinal Julian himself the first earnest opposition to Pope Eugene proceeded. Instead of executing the above commission, he sent to the pope a communication in reply, representing to him the great danger which would result from following out that commission, and boldly expressing many plain truths. "Had I"

[1] Raynaldi annales (Lucae 1752) tom. ix., ad ann. 1431, Nr. 20, 21, p. 104, 105.

—he writes[1]—"been present at the Roman court at that time (when the pope came to the resolution of dissolving the council), and could I have known there the dangers, which here perhaps (or not perhaps) are impending, you certainly would not have come with such a message, the very report of which has already excited much scandal and great uneasiness. What, then, may we conclude, will happen, should the commission be executed? How much more advisable it had been to have intimated this scheme to me, who am here in the midst of the scene; then, informed of the whole state of the case, you could have made up your mind more maturely. How, indeed, is it possible to consult and decide rightly, if the matter to be decided is not known in all its essential circumstances. Let your holiness patiently listen, whilst I state what troubles have arisen here, and what imminent danger threatens ruin to the faith. What would the heretics say, should the council be dissolved? Would they not exult over ours, and behave themselves more proudly than ever? Would not the church confess that she has been overcome, since she ventured not to await the coming of those who have been summoned (the Bohemian deputies invited to negotiation)? O how great would be the shame brought on the Christian faith here! Would not men believe they saw in it the finger of God? Armed troops have often fled before them; but now the universal church herself also flies! They cannot be overcome, then, either by weapons or by arguments! What would the whole world say, on hearing of this? Will they not say, the clergy are incapable of amendment, and are determined to stick in their mire? So many councils have been held in our days, and no reformation has resulted from one of them. The nations were expecting that from this council some fruit would come. But if it shall be thus dissolved, it will be said that we have trifled with God and man. And as no remaining hope of our amendment will exist, the laity will, with good reason, set upon us as the Hussites have done; and in truth rumours to that effect are already afloat. The minds of men are full of mischief: they already begin to spew out the poison that is to bring death to us. They will think that they do God an acceptable service, in assas-

1 See the letter cited on p. 36.

sinating or robbing ecclesiastics. Because these will seem to be sunk in the lowest depths of sin, they will be hateful to God and men; and the slight reverence which is paid them even now, will then vanish entirely. This council was one means still, by which the people of the world could be in some measure restrained; but when they see every hope dashed to the ground, they will let loose the reins and persecute us openly. Alas! what honour is it which is to accrue to the Roman court for dissolving a council assembled for the reformation of the church! Assuredly, will all the odium, all the guilt and shame fall back on them; inasmuch as they were the first occasion of so great an evil, and carried it to a higher pitch. O, holy father! far be it from me that you should be liable to be called the cause of so great evil! At your hands will be demanded the blood of those that perish! Of all, even to the last farthing, you must render an account on that day. What will you say then? What reason will you be able to adduce? If God threatens so terrible a sentence upon those who offend even the least ones in the church, what shall be done when offence is given to the whole church?" "And"—he says afterwards—"although, in case the council remains in session, none of the good described should be the result, still however, if it be dissolved, all will say, If the council had not been dissolved, so many and so great benefits would have resulted from it. And the responsibility for all this will be thrown on your holiness, and never will you be able to get rid of the stigma. And although it is said, that such a prorogation and removal is made for a good end, to the end that, at another place, if your holiness should be present in person, still greater good might be effected, still nobody will believe it; because, they say, we were cheated at the council of Siena; and so we have been at this also. A legate was sent, bulls were sent, and yet a change of the place and a delay of the time is sought! The heretics should be asked, whether they too are willing to suspend, for a year and a half, the spreading of their poison. They also who have been scandalized by the ugly lives of the clergy should be asked, whether they will not be scandalized in the meanwhile. Every day the abuses among the clergy give occasion of offence, and yet shall the remedy be put off? Let all be done now, that can be done. What remains, may be

deferred another year and a half. I fear, that ere another year and a half have elapsed, unless the thing is provided for in some other way, the major part of the German clergy will be destroyed." He reminds the pope of the commission given to him in reference to this council, and goes on to say: "If your holiness had dreamt of dissolving this council so soon, it would have been better not to have begun it. What does your holiness fear, as you have lived so uprightly, that others rather have occasion to fear you, than you to fear them?" He then goes on to refute the other reasons brought forward by the pope. If the pope himself could not come, on account of illness, he could nominate representatives. This was not the first council that had been held without the presence of the pope. As to the safety of the place, nothing was to be feared on that score. The citizens of Basle had promised in every form, as had been lately done at Constance, to defend the council against every one. As from so many quarters complaints had arisen, that the superfluity of worldly goods had occasioned the corruption of the clergy, and many voices had been heard to assert that the clergy must return back to their original poverty, in order to become free from worldliness, so a solicitude might here and there be created, lest the reformatory spirit of a council might lead to the determination of depriving the clergy of all their worldly possessions. In reference to such a solicitude, Julian remarks: "If this council did not consist of men of the church, such a solicitude might perhaps have some foundation. But what *clergyman* would agree to any such resolution? Not one. Not because it would be contrary to the faith only, but contrary also to their own interests. What laymen would agree to it? None, or very few. And if some princes should perhaps send delegates to the council, they would generally send ecclesiastics, noways disposed to agree to any such resolution. And the few laymen who might appear there, would find it impossible to get a hearing when affairs relating to the church were in discussion. And I scarcely believe that among them all there would be present ten secular lords in person; perhaps not five. Then I do not believe, that this council will prove to be a greater one than that at Constance, or that at Pisa; and yet at neither of these councils was this question introduced. The Holy Ghost had never permitted

anything contrary to the faith to be determined at any council; why then was a different result to be apprehended from this council at Basle? It betrayed a want of confidence in the Holy Ghost." Then he says: "But I fear the same will happen to us that happened to the Jews, who said: The Romans will come and take away our place and nation. Thus, by a righteous judgment of God, may it also turn out with us; because we are not willing that a council should be held, we shall lose our divine goods. And would we may not also lose body and soul together. When God has determined to send a calamity on a people, he first so orders it that the danger is not understood and not regarded. So it seems to stand at present with the men of the church, whom I often accuse of blindness: they see the fire, and yet rush headlong into it." "Never"—says he—"would any council have been held, if such fear had seized the hearts of our fathers, as has taken possession of ours." He then lays before the pope another well-grounded cause for anxiety; for, as it was quite possible that the council of Basle would not consent either to the removal or to the prorogation of the council, a new schism might be the consequence. It had been declared already, that the pope's course stood in direct contradiction with the principles expressed at the council of Constance. Men seemed, moreover, to protest in the strongest terms against it; had said that to do anything of that sort was the same as to prevent the extirpation of heresies, the reformation of manners, the repose of the Christian people; and consequently the same as to promote heresies, war, and hatred. The pope had given, as a reason for the measure he proposed, the negotiations of union with the Greeks. To this the cardinal replies: It was looked upon as a great folly, that on account of the uncertain project of bringing back the Greeks to church union, the now and ever faithful Germany should be left to fall into the heresy of the Bohemians. For it was said, this was greatly to be feared, unless some remedy should be speedily applied; and that that song about the Greeks had been already sung three hundred years ago, and was every year sung over again. Both might be done, being good things; the first now, at a fixed and settled time; the other a year and a half from now; and all would very gladly afterwards come and attend the proposed second coun-

cil. He entreated the pope at least to put off the execution of this step until July. Meantime, the now existing mischiefs and grievances would be removed, the call of the Hussites to the council, and the preparations for the war with the Bohemians, would no longer stand in the way: for by that time everything would be finished. Many arrangements might, during the same time, be made for the reformation of the German clergy, and published in Germany; and thus something would be done; and nothing could be laid to the charge of the pope; and that which at the present time would only give offence, and could effect no good object whatever, might then be done with more honour. He assures the pope, that all his faithful servants felt greatly troubled about this matter, especially the archbishops of Trier and of Regensburg, who were then present in Basle. It seemed to them all that a lasting disgrace would fasten itself upon the pope and the Roman court.

SECTION SECOND.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY AND DOCTRINE.

I. Movements towards Reform in England.

That the greater freedom of thought resulting from the reaction against the church theocratic system had its first beginning in England, is to be attributed to various causes which prepared the way for such an event. The high pretensions of the hierarchy since the time of Innocent III., who sought to make the kings of England his vassals, had, in this country, reached their acmé; and for this very reason the nation awakened to the consciousness of independence, the advocates of its rights, its government, and the free-hearted men among its clergy were aroused to opposition. In the thirteenth century, Bishop Robert Grosshead, or Capito of Lincoln, had set an example of courageous resistance to that arbitrary will of the popes in disposing of church offices, which was so fertile a source of corruption; and in his writings were scattered many seminal principles of reformatory truths, which long continued to operate. It is apparent that the works of this man, who, under the name of Lincolniensis, held a distinguished rank among the scholastic theologians, were afterwards diligently studied by the party of Wicklif in England and of Huss in Bohemia; and these writings seem to have had great influence in exciting a mode of thinking favourable to reform. Next after this distinguished man followed that profound and original thinker, Roger Bacon, whose whole mode of thinking was also calculated to awaken a freer spirit. The contest betwixt the mendicant friars—an order which spread, especially in England, with alarming rapidity—and the University of Oxford and the parish priests, who saw their rights encroached upon by the spiritual labours of these monks, had in like manner contributed to make men conscious of the abuses of the dominant

church system, and to provoke attacks upon it. In this contest, Archbishop Richard of Armagh distinguished himself as a forerunner of Wicklif, by his freedom of thought; and he is often cited under the name of Richard Armacanus, as a witness in favour of the freer spirit, in the contest with the mendicant orders. There arose in the English parliament, under the reign of Edward III., a spirit of earnest zeal for the prerogatives of the state, and against the encroachments of the pope upon its rights and its independence. Under such circumstances and influences, appeared the English reformer of whom we are now to speak.

John Wicklif was born in the year 1324 in the village of Wycliffe (whence according to the custom of this age he received his name), in the county of York, not far from the city of Richmond. He studied philosophy and theology at the University of Oxford, and obtained there an academical degree. He soon distinguished himself by his mental gifts, his freedom of mind, his zeal for learning, for the prosperity of the church, and the religious interests of the people. In his pervading practical bent, we recognize a peculiarity of the English mind, which has constantly been preserved. But to this was joined in the case of Wicklif an original speculative element; an element which in these times was also especially developed among the English, though at a later period it retired more into the back ground. He subsequently occupied an important place in the philosophical school of the realists, which maintained a fierce contest with the nominalism that had revived since the time of William Occam. By his book "On the reality of universal conceptions," *De universalibus realibus*, he had created an important epoch extending into the fifteenth century; and we shall perceive how closely combined together in him were the philosophical and the theological elements, how much his theological opinions were influenced by his realism. Bold in his practical bearing, never shrinking from any of the consequences resulting from the principles which he advocated, he exhibited the same boldness and the same consistency in the manner also in which he carried out his speculative conclusions. By his meditations on the sad condition of the church in his time he was led to study the prophecies which came from, or were ascribed to the abbot

Joachim, and with which the men who longed after a regeneration of the church busied themselves a good deal at that time; and thus arose the first work in which he appeared before the public and expressed his views on the corruption of the church. This work, composed in the English language, and entitled, "On the last times of the church," has lately appeared by itself in a new edition. At first Wicklif in his reformatory tendency found a friend in the primate of the English church, Islep, archbishop of Canterbury. The latter, who had been Wicklif's friend at the university, founded in 1631, at the University of Oxford, the college of Canterbury Hall; which was to consist of eleven students under a master as their overseer (tutor). Eight of these students were at first secular clergymen, the three others, monks; and he appointed Woodhall, a monk, overseer.[1] The latter seems to have been a turbulent, quarrelsome man, and fomented discord between the secular clergy and the monks, who, as a general thing, could never easily live on good terms with one another. This led the archbishop, in the year 1363, to terminate the controversy, by declaring in favour of the seculars, expelling the monks, and appointing Wicklif,—whom he characterised, in the installation, as a man in whose circumspection, fidelity, and activity, he had the utmost confidence, and to whom he gave this post on account of his honourable deportment and his learning,—master of the college. In the year 1366, however, Islep died; and a man of an altogether different way of thinking, Simon Langham, heretofore bishop of Ely, who, having been educated among the monks, was their friend, succeeded him. When the monks who had been expelled from the college brought their complaints before Langham, he restored them, and Wicklif lost his place. Thinking himself wronged, Wicklif appealed to the Roman chancery. After the usual fashion at the court of Avignon, the cause met with delays. In the meantime, Wicklif had openly taken his stand on a certain question in a way which was not calculated to make an impression which would be very favourable to him at that court. Pope Urban V. had, in the year 1365, demanded a thousand marks as quit rent, by virtue of the feudal relation in

1 Lewis, history of the life and sufferings of J. Wiclif, London, 1720, p. 8, sq. (A new edition, corrected and enlarged by the author, Oxford, 1820, p. 9, sq.)

which the English realm under king John Sansterre had placed itself to the popes.[1] The English parliament declared, that King John had violated his oath, in consenting to surrender so much of the independence of the state for the purpose of paying such a tribute; for that King John was not authorized, without the concurrence of the parliament, to place himself in any such relation to the pope. Out of this arose a controversy. One of the mendicant friars wrote in defence of the pope's cause; but Wicklif appeared against him. He expressed himself with great freedom in his paper on this subject.[2] He attributed to the king the right, not only in concurrence with his parliament to repudiate that quit rent, but also to bring the clergy, in civil suits, before a secular court, to deprive them of any excessive superfluity of worldly goods; since this, although contrary, no doubt, to many ecclesiastical laws, was still grounded, however, in the ancient practice of the English realm, in the constitution of the state, in the laws of nature, and in Holy Scripture. We here perceive already the early bent of the man, who made the sacred Scriptures the ultimate standard of all law, and who afterwards declared it to be the great problem of church evolution, to reform everything according to the principles therein contained; as it was, in fact, his endeavours to do this which procured for him the title of *doctor evangelicus*. Such a procedure of Wicklif could not but contribute, in co-operation with the influence of the monks of Avignon, to bring about an adverse decision of his process at that court. So much the more, however, did he by this step recommend himself to those who stood up for the prerogatives of the state. They were at no loss to understand how useful to their cause a man of such zeal, such courage, and such talents might prove, and were therefore the more inclined to give him their support in his bolder attacks on the hierarchy. He was made chaplain to the king;[3] and he attracted in particular the attention of the king's brother, the powerful duke of Lancaster. His connection with this duke turned out to be of great moment to Wicklif in his later contests. In the year 1372 he[4] was made doctor of theology, and now acquired a mighty influence as well

1 Vaughan, life and opinions of Iohn de Wycliffe, Lond. 1828, tom. i. p. 264 sq.
2 Ibid. p. 270. 3 Vaughan, tom. i. p. 277. 4 Lewis, p. 18, (new ed. p. 21.)

by his lectures as by his writings. He daily took still stronger ground against the corruptions of the church, and was carried along from one step to another in his progress as a reformer. His polemics were aimed particularly against the mendicant monks. He was enabled, at first, to attach himself to a general movement of reform, at the head of which stood the government and the parliament itself; and it was well understood on that side how to turn his talents to account. He had already expressed in various ways his complaints of the extortions practised by the Roman court on the churches, of its arbitrary interferences in church elections, its practice of conferring high offices in the church on Italians who were unfit for the spiritual calling, and ignorant of the language and customs of the country. After an effort had vainly been made to remove these grievances by negotiation with Pope Gregory XI., an embassy composed of seven persons was sent to the pope in the year 1374 for the purpose of effecting this object, and Wicklif was one of the seven.[1] This embassy did not visit the seat of the papacy, but met the papal nuncios at Bruges. The negotiations lasted two years; and owing, doubtless, to the mixing in of their own selfish interests by one or two English bishops, it so happened that much less was accomplished than had been intended at the outset. The share which Wicklif took in these negotiations seems not to have been without influence on his development as a reformer, since he was thus enabled to obtain a more intimate knowledge of the spirit of the Roman chancery, of the corruptions springing from that quarter, and of the intrigues prevailing there; and was led to examine more closely into the rights of the papacy, and to come out more vehemently in opposition to it as the principal cause of the corruption in the church. He came to the conviction that the papacy had not its origin in divine right; that the church stood in no need of a visible head. He spoke and wrote against the worldly spirit of the papacy, and its hurtful influence. He was wont to call the pope antichrist, "the proud worldly priest of Rome,"[2] "the most cursed of clippers and purse-kervers." He says in one of his papers,[3] "The pope and his collectors draw from our country what should serve

1 Lewis, p. 29 sq. (n. ed. p. 33 sq.)
2 Lewis, p. 32 (n. ed. 37.)
3 Ibid. p. 32, (n. ed. 37.)

for the support of the poor, and many thousand marks from the king's treasury for sacraments and spiritual things"—which is aimed against the simony encouraged and promoted at Rome. "And certainly"—says he—"though our realm had a huge hill of gold, and no man took therefrom but this proud worldly priest's collector, in process of time the hill would be spent; for he is ever taking money out of our land, and sends nothing back but God's curse for his simony, and some accursed clerk of Antichrist to rob the land still more for wrongful privileges, or else leave to do God's will, that men should do without his leave, and buying and selling," etc.[1]

Already, in these first public acts of Wicklif, we recognize principles which he did but still further unfold in all his subsequent labours as a reformer. It was to the cupidity of the church that led her to seize upon a foreign secular province, to the superfluity of worldly goods in the hands of the clergy, that he felt compelled to trace the corruption in the church. The aim of his efforts was to bring the clergy to live wholly to their spiritual vocation. They were, above all, to follow the pattern of Christ in poverty, self-denial, and renunciation of the world. The example of their lives should give emphasis to their preaching. Constantly hovering before the mind of Wicklif was that image of the apostles preaching the gospel in poverty; and that other picture which, ever since the time of Arnold of Brescia, had been so often held up by Apostolicals, Franciscans, Waldenses, of the worldliness, pomp, and luxury of the corrupt clergy. Again, he insisted that the clergy, caring only for the good of their flocks, should be content to receive from them whatever might be necessary for the supply of their bodily wants. He reckoned it as a part of their calling to stand up for the rights of the poor. He regarded whatever was given to the clergy merely for the purpose of ministering to their luxury, as so much taken from the poor. From the first, he was a declared enemy of the begging-monks; as they, on the other hand, were the most zealous and the most

1 Lewis, p. 32, (n. ed. 37.) And certes tho our rewme had an huge hill of gold, and never other man took thereof but only this proud worldly priest's collector; by process of time this hill must be spended; for he taketh ever money out of our lond, and sendeth nought agen but God's curse for his simony, and accursed Antichrist's clerk to rob more the lond for wrongful privilege, or else leave to do God's will, that men shulden do without his lead, and buying and selling.

influential organs of the Roman hierarchy, which he attacked. They appeared to him the chief promoters of superstition, of the externalization of religion into forms and ceremonies, of the immoral tendencies made safe and secure by false reliances. But let us cite his own words. In one of his pieces, entitled "A Short Rule of Life,"[1] we find the following address to the ministers of religion: "If thou art a priest, and by name a curate, live thou a holy life. Pass other men in holy prayer, holy desire, and holy speaking; in counselling, and teaching the truth. Ever keep the commandments of God, and let his gospel and his praises be ever in thy mouth. Let thy open life be thus a true book, in which the soldier and the layman may learn how to serve God and keep his commandments. For the example of a good life, if it be open and continued, striketh rude men much more than open preaching with the word alone." He says afterwards, in conclusion: "Have both meat and drink, and clothing; but the remnant give truly to the poor: to those who have freely wrought, but who now may not labour, from feebleness or sickness; and thus thou shalt be a true priest, both to God and to man." He was by no means disposed to lower the order of the clergy in the eyes of the people; on the contrary, he believed that he honoured and exalted it, by exhibiting clearly the true significance of their vocation. Thus in one of his earlier pieces, addressing himself to laymen, he says: "Thy second father is thy spiritual father, who has special care of thy soul, and thus thou shalt revere him. Thou shalt love him especially, before other men, and obey his teaching as far as he teaches God's will. And thou shalt help, according to thy power, that he may have a reasonable sustenance when he doth well his office." But while it was generally the case that the objective dignity of the priesthood was chiefly held up to view; while this was regarded as something inalienable, and represented as an unconditional object of reverence for the laity; Wicklif, on the contrary, made the veneration which should be paid to the clergy, depend on their personal worth. The sense of religion and the conscience of the laity should no longer subserve the private ends of their spiritual guides; the will of God should be more to them than all else, should be the rule by which

[1] Vaughan, vol. i., p. 312.

they were to judge even of their clergy. But in case the latter fell short of this rule, they were not to exalt themselves, but should seek in the first place, in love and in humility, to correct the clergy by private admonition. In the same treatise he says: "If thy spiritual father fail in his office, by giving evil example, and in ceasing to teach God's law, thou art bound to have great sorrow on that account, and to tell meekly and charitably his fault to him, between thee and him alone." He remonstrated against that worldly spirit of the clergy which led them to engage in business foreign to their calling: "Neither prelates"—he says "nor doctors, priests, nor deacons, should hold secular offices; that is, those of chancery, treasury, privy-seal, and other such secular offices in the exchequer,—more especially while secular men are sufficient to do such offices." In another treatise he complains that "prelates and great religious possessioners are so occupied in heart about worldly lordships and with plans of business, that no habit of devotion, of praying, of thoughtfulness on heavenly things, on the sins of their own heart, or on those of other men, may be preserved; neither may they be found studying and preaching of the gospel, nor visiting and comforting of poor men. In a manuscript of "Feigned Contemplative Life," he says: "they resemble bailiffs rather than bishops;" they were so far sunk in worldliness, that they could not rebuke the worldly lives of others. It serves to characterize Wicklif's tendency as a reformer, to compare it, on the one hand, with the later development of the work of reformation in England and of the reformed church generally, and on the other, with the German reformation by Luther; and to notice that one of the first works of his as a reformer, was a detailed exposition of the Ten Commandments,[1] in which he contrasted the immoral life prevalent among all ranks, in his time, with what these commandments require. We should undoubtedly keep in mind what he tells us himself, that he was led to do this by the ignorance which most people betrayed of the decalogue; and that it was his design to counteract a tendency which shewed greater concern for the opinions of men than the law of God. But at the same time we cannot fail to perceive an inclination to derive the whole body of Christian morality from the Ten Commandments, an inclination to

1 Exposition of the Decalogue, Vaughan, vol. i., p. 319.

adopt in whole the Old Testament form of the law, which shows itself in his applying the law of the Sabbath to the Christian observance of Sunday. In this work he seems still to have clung to the prevailing views respecting the veneration of saints and of images. But in a homily preached two years later,[1] and after his return from the above-mentioned embassy to Bruges, he condemns the custom of addressing prayers to the saints, and he does this in connection with a doctrine also grounded in the church teaching of his time, that no man can be certain with regard to others, any more than he can with regard to himself, whether he belongs to the number of the elect. No one ought to be worshipped as a saint, unless it be known certainly, by revelation of Holy Scripture, that he is incorporated into the community of heaven. He calls in doubt, also, the utility of any such kind of worship. It is characteristic of him, that he does not spiritualize the law of the Sabbath into the Christian sense, but applies it simply[2] to the particular observance of one day, although he acknowledges that, considered from the Christian point of view, the observance of the Sabbath is commemorative rather of the resurrection of Christ and the effusion of the Holy Spirit, than the work of creation. He points out, as the duties which distinguish the celebration of this day, devout meditation, the public worship of God, and works of Christian charity. Near the conclusion of this commentary, he rebukes that confidence in outward things whereby man would hush the alarms of conscience. "Many think"—says he[3]—"if they give a penny to a pardoner, they shall be forgiven the breaking of all the commandments of God, and therefore they take no heed how they keep them. But I say thee, for certain, though thou have priests and friars to sing for thee, and though thou each day hear many masses, and found chauntries and colleges, and go on pilgrimages all thy life, and give all thy goods to pardoners, all this shall not bring thy soul to heaven. While, if the commandments of God are revered to the end, though neither penny nor half-penny be possessed, there shall be everlasting pardon and the bliss of heaven." If Wicklif, in these and many other instances, where he places the moral element in strong contrast with the

1 Vaughan, 320 note.
2 Ibid. 326.
3 Ibid. vol. i., p. 329.

one-sided bent of an outward piety, and the superstition that made men feel secure in the service of sin, so expresses himself, as if he seemed to place his whole reliance on good works; yet we must not forget that he ever presupposes the connection of all this with trust on Jesus as the only Saviour, and with the practical imitation of him which such trust implies. Accordingly, at the end of his commentary he says: "To suffer for Christ can be no hard requirement, since he has so greatly suffered for us;" and he commends the contemplation of the sufferings through which apostles, martyrs, and confessors have arrived at their present exaltation, as an inducement to endure the evils of the times with resignation and in a triumphant spirit.[1]

As regards the second matter, the mendicant order of monks, Wicklif, in a treatise directed against them, attacks in particular their exorbitant influence at the university; the arts by which they drew over the young men to them. "The friars"—says he —"drive the youth from the religion of Christ, in their several orders, by hypocrisy, falsehood, and theft. For they say, before them, that their particular order is holier than any other, and that they shall take a higher place in the bliss of heaven than others who are not members of it; and that people of their order would never come to perdition, but would, on the day of judgment, with Christ judge others. And thus they steal away children from fathers and mothers, sometimes such as are incapable of ordination, and sometimes such as, by the commandment of God, are bound to support their elders."[2] "Hence"—says he—"they are blasphemers of God, who confidently advise things of a doubtful character, which are, in the Holy Scriptures, neither expressly commanded nor forbidden." He reproaches them with representing their private orders as perfect, as orders founded by Christ. But even on the supposition that some order, or a particular foundation, were more perfect than ordinary institutions, still they would be wrong in their practice; for they could not know but it might prove the means of everlasting perdition to the child which they desired so early to bind to vows of their order, if it should be repugnant to his natural disposition; for it must, as yet, be uncertain for what rank or calling God had

1 Vaughan p. 329. 2 Lewis, p. 5 sq. (new ed. 7 sq.)

destined the child. He disputes the position, that such a way of living was the most perfect imitation of the life of Christ; for Christ had by no means bred himself to such kind of poverty; he had not asked everybody without distinction to give him alms, but received from Mary Madgalene and other pious women and men what was necessary for his subsistence. Christ bade his disciples not to take scrip or purse; these, on the contrary, were used by the begging-monks for the purpose of conveying home whatever they had begged to their monasteries. Christ directed his apostles rather to consider who were prepared to receive the message of the gospel; with such they were to eat and drink, and not to go about from house to house. He adverts to the example of the apostle Paul, who supported himself and his companions with the labour of his own hands; and sought not to obtain gold and silver, nor apparel, from those whom he instructed; thus instructing other teachers, by his example, that in times of distress they should do likewise. He says: "If any would not work, neither should he eat." He appeals to the treatise of Augustin, *De opera Monachorum.* He calls it a transgression of Christ's command, when, instead of giving their alms to the poor, the blind, the lame, or the halt, men gave them to a set of hypocrites, who represented themselves as holy and needy, whilst in fact they were robust of body, rich in possessions, dwelt in large houses, owned splendid raiment, made great banquets, and possessed many precious stones and treasures.

In addition to his duties as university theologian, Wicklif had also taken upon himself the practical work of teaching and labouring among the people whose religious interests he from the first had near at heart. In the year 1375 he became parish priest of Lutterworth in the county of Leicester; and now laboured alternately as teacher of theology at Oxford, and as preacher and curate at Lutterworth. The zeal with which he discharged his duties as a preacher is proved by the 300 sermons of his still preserved in manuscript.[1] He attached the highest importance to the sermon as a means of supplying the religious wants of the people. Accordingly he regarded the attempt, from higher quarters, to limit and circumscribe the predicatorial office as a

1 Vaughan, vol.ii, p. 12.

thing standing in direct contrariety to the life of Christ and of the apostles.[1] Hence he made the sermon a principal thing in the improvements introduced into public worship; and endeavoured to lead the way in this reform by his own example, as well as to encourage the clergy, who followed him in their course of training, to do the same. While he took special pains to get the hearts of Christians interested in works of charity; in bestowing sympathy and relief on the suffering, whether from age, from sickness, or from poverty; in providing for all their bodily wants, yet he describes it as a still nobler and more important work to look after such as were neglected as to their religious wants, and to provide for the welfare of their souls. "Men"—says he—"in a sermon on Philippians iii., who love not the souls, have little love for the bodies of their neighbours;" and hence the work of Christian instruction is described as "the best service that man may do for his brother."[2] In his Exposition of the Ten Commandments, the Christian man is enjoined "to visit those who are sick, or who are in trouble, especially those whom God hath made needy by age, or by other sickness, as the feeble, the blind, and the lame, who are in poverty. These thou shalt relieve with thy goods, after thy power, and after their need, for thus biddeth the gospel."[3] In the letter to "Simple Priests," he declares preaching to be the great duty of their office: "for this Christ enjoined on his disciples more than any other; by this he conquered the world out of the fiend's hand." In an unpublished tract against the monks[4]—he says—"The highest service that men can arrive at on earth is to preach the word of God. This service falls peculiarly to priests, and therefore God more straitly demands it of them. Hereby should they produce children to God, and that is the end for which God has wedded the church. Lovely it might be, to have a son that were lord of this world, but fairer much it were to have a son in God, who, as a member of Holy Church, shall ascend to Heaven! And for this cause Jesus Christ left other works, and occupied himself mostly in preaching; and thus did his apostles, and for this God loved them." He

[1] He says: Nam praedicationis officium est proscriptum, et officium spoliandi subditos est inductum. Dialog. lib. quat. ed. Wirth, Francof. et Lips. 1753, p. 131.

[2] Vaughan, vol. ii., p. 14.

[3] Ibid. p. 13.

[4] "Contra fratres," ibid. p. 14 sq.

cites in proof the words of Christ, Luke xi. 28. In a treatise on the Feigned Contemplative Life,[1] he describes it as a temptation of the great adversary, when men allow themselves to be drawn off by zeal for the contemplative life, from the office of preaching. "Before all"—says he—"we are bound to follow Christ; yet Christ preached the gospel and charged his disciples to do the same. All the prophets and John the Baptist were constrained by love to forsake the desert, renounce the contemplative life, and to preach." "Ah, Lord"—he exclaims—"what cursed spirit of falsehood moveth priests to close themselves within stone-walls for all their life, since Christ commanded all his apostles and priests to go into all the world, and to preach the gospel? Certainly they are open fools, and do plainly against the gospel; and if they continue in this error, are accursed of God as perilous deceivers and heretics."[2] In his work against the monks, he replies to those who cited the example of Mary Magdalene as a reason for preferring the contemplative life: "The example might be pertinent if the priests were women, and if no command opposed to a life of solitude could be found in Scripture." From what was usually said respecting the value of the contemplative life, it might be gathered "that Christ, when in this world, chose the life least suited to it, and that he has obliged all his priests to forsake the better and take the worse." "Prayer"—he remarks—"is good; but not so good as preaching; and accordingly, in preaching, and also in praying, in the giving of sacraments, the learning of the law of God, and the rendering of a good example by purity of life, in these should stand the life of a priest."[3] Wicklif was of the opinion, that the preachers connected with a particular church were unequal to the task of providing for the wants of the neglected people. The idea of travelling preachers originated with him. In vindication of this method, also, he appeals to the example of Christ. "The gospel"—he says—"relates how Jesus went about in the places of the country, both great and small, as in cities and castles, or small towns, and this to teach us to profit generally unto men, and not to forbear to teach to a people, because they are few, and our name may not, in consequence, be great."[4] This idea of Wicklif, however, as is

1 "Of a Feigned Contemplative Life," yet unpublished. Ibid. p. 19.
2 Ibid. p. 18. 3 Ibid. p. 19. 4 Ibid. p. 23.

evident from the earlier history of the church, was not entirely new, but was traditionally connected with an idea which had appeared under various forms ever since the close of the twelfth century.

As other men, possessed of the spirit of reform, had, from the time just mentioned, founded spiritual societies, whose members travelled about clad, as they conceived it, after the manner of the apostles, to look after the religious needs of the people perishing through neglect, so Wicklif founded a society of this sort, constituting his school in the more limited sense, who called themselves "poor priests," and were subsequently called Lollards, a name similar to that of the Beghards, which was also similarly used, to denote persons of a pietistic, unchurchly bent. They went about barefoot, in long robes of a russet colour.[1] Even Wicklif, as it seems, was not wholly free from the mistake of apprehending literally the duty of following the pattern of the apostolic church; and from this point of view he might be led to judge too unfavourably of the arrangement by which parish priests were set over particular churches. We should consider, however, that Wicklif had before his eyes the wicked, arbitrary mode of filling church offices in his time, the influence of bad arts and of simony, and in connection therewith the neglect of a great portion of the people, for whose religious needs no provision at all was made by the great number of bad ecclesiastics and monks. There was some just warrant in these circumstances for the idea of constituting the clergy into a seminary for domestic missions, so that the members, without feeling themselves confined to any particular spot, might be ready to go to any place where they might be needed, to help the people in their spiritual distress. We see this bent very distinctly manifested in Wicklif's essay on the question "Why poor priests have no benefices."[2] Speaking here of the bad system of patronage, and of the bad management of the benefices, he says: "But if there be any simple man who desireth to live well, and to teach truly the law of God, and despise pride and other sins both of prelates and

1 Talaribus indutos vestibus de russeto. Walsingham hist. angl. in Anglica, Normannica, Hibernica, a veteribus scripta, Francof. 1603, p. 191.

Lewis, p. 287, (left out in the new edition): Why poor priests have no benefices.

other men, he shall be deemed a hypocrite, a new teacher, a heretic, and not suffered to come to any benefice. If in any little poor place he shall live a poor life, he shall be so persecuted and slandered, that he shall be put out by wiles, and imprisoned or burnt."[1] He states that many great lords, in order to palliate their simony, by which the most worthless of men obtained high offices, pretended that they did not want any money, as a price for the place, but only a present, as for example, "a kerchief for the lady, or a palfrey, or a tun of wine. And when some lords would present a good man, then some ladies are the means of having a dancer presented, or a tripper on tapits, or a hunter, or a hawker, or a wild player of summer gambols."[2] He denounces the prelates and lords, who co-operated in these practices, as the allies of antichrist. They would not suffer Christ's disciples to teach his children the law of Christ so as to save their souls. And thus they laboured to banish Christ and his law out of his heritage, *i.e.* those souls whom he redeemed, not with corruptible gold and silver, but with the precious blood of his own heart, which he shed on the cross from glowing love. "Now it is to escape such sins"—says Wicklif—"that some poor priests take no benefices. The poor priests were afraid that if they received such particular appointments they should be withdrawn thereby from better employments, from such as would bring more benefit to the church. That was what they had to fear more than anything else; for it concerned directly their own persons; for they had received their whole calling from God to help their brethren, that they might get to heaven, by their teaching, their prayers, and example. And it seemed to them that they could most easily fulfil this vocation by a general curacy of Christian love after the example of Christ and the apostles. They had never been tied down to one particular place, like a chained dog. By this means they could easily deliver themselves from danger, and were enabled to give most assistance to their brethren. So now, the poor priests, when persecuted by the clerks of antichrist,

1 But if there be any simple man, that desireth to live well and teche truly God's law, and despise pride and other sins both of prelates and other men, he shall ben holden an hypocrite, a new teacher, an heretick, and not suffered to come to any benefice. L. 1. p. 287.

2 P. 289.

could flee without let or hindrance from one city to another, as Christ commanded in the gospel. So they could best be present at once and lend their aid, according to the promptings of the Holy Spirit, at any spot where they were needed. In this way priests and laymen, free from all strife, would be joined together in love.[1] Thus some poor priests had associated themselves together, for the purpose of following to the utmost the example of Christ and the apostles; of labouring where there was the most need, as long as they still retained the vigour of youth, without condemning other priests, who faithfully did their duty."

Wicklif, by these labours, had gained a small party in *his favour*, as well as raised up a considerable number of enemies. He well understood what dangers he must encounter by undertaking the work of a reformer, how easily in these times a man might, in fighting against the corruptions of the church, be called to suffer martyrdom. He affirms, that it was an invention of hypocrisy to hold that martyrdom was no longer possible, because all were Christians. He who declares the truth which is opposed to their corruption, to prelates—whom he calls satraps—shall not escape their deadly hatred and may therefore die as martyrs. "And so"—he proceeds—"we Christians need not visit the heathen for the purpose of converting them and dying as martyrs; but let us but steadfastly preach the law of Christ, even to the imperial prelates, and straightway there shall be a blooming martyrdom, if we hold on in faith and patience."[2] He intimates that many, especially the begging monks, sought his death.[3] But death could not terrify him, "for"—says he—"I know from the evangelical faith, that antichrist with his blows can only destroy the body; but Christ, for whose cause I fight, can destroy both soul and body in hell. And I know that he will suffer nothing to be wanting of that which is most needful for his servants, when he has freely surrendered himself to a terrible death, and permitted all the disciples who were dearest to him to endure severe torments for their own benefit.[4] The begging monks are here

1 Lewis, p. 297.

2 Dialog. p. 126.

3 Specialiter cum tanta multitudo fratrum et aliorum vocatorum Christianorum clamant contra tuam sententiam, et mortem tuam multipliciter machinantur. Ibid. p. 189.

4 Ibid. p. 196.

mentioned as his fiercest enemies, and they stood at the head of the opposite party. In the year 1376, they extracted from his lectures, writings, and sermons, nineteen propositions which they marked as heretical, and sent to Rome, that they might there be condemned. These propositions, doubtless, corresponded with the teachings of Wicklif, although when rent from the connection in which they were held forth by him, they sounded more harshly than in their proper place, and were liable to be misapprehended. They related to the unlimited power of the pope; the secular possessions of the church; the rights of laymen over priests; the power of the keys; the conditional validity of excommunication. We will notice the most remarkable of these propositions. "That no political and temporal rule has been bestowed in perpetuity on the pope and the prelates; God himself could not, by his almighty power, bestow such rule in perpetuity on any man and his posterity."[1] "That the perseveringly righteous had not only the right to possess, but also to enjoy all earthly things."[2] This is the doctrine so much spoken of, that all right of property, and all power, are things morally conditioned; therefore everything here depends on the subjective worth of the individual—with sin is lost the title to possess anything. Such assertions it had been attempted already to find in many church fathers, and such positions created from this time onward a great sensation, and were particularly made use of for the purpose of throwing suspicion on the cause of Wicklif, and afterwards on that of Huss, in a political point of view. When such propositions were taken literally and singly, they could indeed be so understood, as if all right were thereby reduced to subjective opinion, all civil power and all civil property made dependant on the subjective judgment of each man, and uncertain; and as if the watchword were thus given for a general upturning of civil society: but as we shall see, Wicklif, though he uses many blunt and imprudent expressions, guards sufficiently against any such misapprehensions. He is speaking simply of the religious and moral point of view, of that which stood valid in the sight of God; not of the political and juridical point of view. "That when the church fell into corruption, the secular lords had the right to deprive her of the temporal goods which

[1] Article 2, Lewis, p. 43 (new ed. p. 46). [2] Art. 4.

she abused."[1] "That every prelate, and also the pope, when he is wrong, may be accused, judged, and imprisoned by his subjects, even laymen."[2] "That only a just excommunication, in accordance with the law of Christ, and none at variance with that law, was binding."[3] "That an unconditional power to bind and to loose, not even God himself could, by virtue of his omnipotence, bestow on any man."[4] That Christ gave the apostles no power to excommunicate on account of secular things, but rather the contrary; therefore the pope possessed no such power." "Every priest regularly ordained had power to administer all the sacraments, and also to bind and to loose."

Pope Gregory XI. thereupon put forth, in the year 1377, against Wicklif, three bulls which he sent to England by a nuncio. One of these was addressed to the University of Oxford, the other to the bishops of Canterbury and London, the third to King Edward III.[5] He pronounced sentence of condemnation on nineteen of Wicklif's propositions, under various qualifications. He marked several of them as agreeing, though not in words, yet in sense, with opinions still earlier held forth by Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno, and condemned by Pope John XXII. He directed the king's attention particularly to the fact that several of these propositions not only contradicted the catholic faith, but also tended to the subversion of civil order. He complained that such doctrines had been suffered to spread so widely. He commanded that Wicklif should be thrown into chains and imprisoned; that he should be allowed to have a hearing in order to know whether he held forth such doctrines, and in what sense; that his answers should be reported at Rome, and the directions for his further treatment should be waited for from that court. The pope, however, having doubtless been informed that Wicklif had powerful patrons in England, ordered at the same time, that, in case it should be found impracticable to get possession of Wicklif's person, still the bishops above named should sit in judgment upon him, and take care that he should be compelled to pay obedience to a citation to Rome. The papal bulls met with no favourable reception in England, except from the

1 Art 17, p. 45 (new ed. p. 48).
2 Art. 19. 3 Art. 15. 4 Art. 14.
5 Raynaldi ann. 1377, No. 4, tom. vii. p. 294.

bishops. At the University of Oxford,[1] either sympathy with Wicklif's cause, or a freer spirit in opposition to papal absolutism, and zeal for the rights of the university, made the authorities for a long time doubtful, whether they should receive the papal bull or reject it with scorn.[2]

Meantime, the old King Edward had died, and his son Richard II. succeeded him in the government. The first parliament held under his reign was animated by a freer spirit of opposition to the papal extortions. This tone of feeling would of itself be favourable to Wicklif upon the arrival of the papal bulls. But, in addition to this, the parliament had entered into a sort of alliance with him personally, as the advocate of the independent authority of the state. The parliament deliberated on the question whether they should not refuse the pope the sums which he demanded, unterrified by any threat of the ban. Wicklif was invited to give his opinion. He pronounced in favour of the refusal, and endeavoured to prove the right of it from the teachings of Christ. The parliament decided in conformity with this opinion. The king's brother, John Gaunt Duke of Lancaster, and the marshal Henry Percy, were zealous patrons of Wicklif, and approvers of his freer spirit.[3] Moreover, he already had many adherents among the people, consisting partly of such as were susceptible to the Christian element in efforts for reform, and in part of such as were glad to join in the spirit of opposition, or had their pleasure in movements pointing to something new.[4]

1 Lewis, p. 46 sq. (new ed. p. 49 sq.)

2 That zealous supporter of the papal party, Walsingham, in his historical work, finds much fault with the conduct of the university, whence we may infer what interest was taken in Wicklif's doctrines at Oxford. Walsingham, loc. laud. p. 201, expresses himself thus: Cujus universitatis moderni procuratores sive rectores quantum degeneraverint a prudentia seu sapientia antiquorum, per hoc facile conjici poterit, quod audita causa adventus dicti papalis nuntii, diu in pendulo haerebant, utrum papalem bullam deberent cum honore recipere, vel omnino cum dedecore refutare. Oxoniense studium generale quam gravi lapsu a sapientiae et scientiae culmine decidisti, quod quondam inextricabilia atque dubia toti mundo declarare consuesti, jam ignorantiae nubilo obfuscatum dubitare non vereris, quae quemlibet e laicis Christianis dubitare non decet!

3 Lewis, p. 51 sq. (new ed. p. 56 sq.)

4 Walsingham, who would naturally, from his own point of view, trace the favour shown to Wicklif, the heretic, to nothing but an impure, worldly interest, says (page 191): Quod domini et magnates terrae multique de populo ipsos (Wiclefitas) in suis praedicationibus confoverunt, et faverunt praedicantibus hos errores. Eo

Hence no one dared to execute the papal bull literally. Yet Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury and Courtney, bishop of London, set up a court at Lambeth near Canterbury, and Wicklif was summoned to appear before this tribunal.[1] The matter created a great sensation. Wicklif appeared before the tribunal at first accompanied by the Duke of Lancaster and Henry Percy. He was obliged to press his way through a dense crowd, who zealously espoused his cause as that of a martyr for the truth. Percy demanded that Wicklif should be allowed to sit, so that he might defend himself at his ease against the articles of complaint.[2] That most zealous opponent of Wicklif, Courtney, bishop of London, would not allow this to a person accused of heresy. But the Duke of Lancaster took up the quarrel on the side of Wicklif, and thus an exchange of words passed between him and the bishop. Thus was brought about the dissolution of the first session of the court. A second was opened in June, 1378. The court, particularly bishop Courtney, was doubtless inclined to proceed with more severity against Wicklif; but they were held in awe by the power of his patrons.[3] The court was obliged to be satisfied, therefore, after Wicklif had given an explanation of the propositions laid to his charge; in doing which he submitted himself to correction by the church in all cases of detected error; he protested against the imputation of being obstinately bent on defending anything erroneous; he explained the propositions in a milder sense, guarded them against misconstruction, but without recanting any one of them. He says, in the concluding sentences of his declaration, "Far be it from the Church of Christ, that the truth should be condemned

nempe maxime, quia potestatem tribuerunt laicis suis assertionibus ad auferendum temporalia a veris ecclesiastices et religiosis. Walsingham's words, showing what a spirit of opposition had been aroused among the laity against ecclesiastics and monks, are: Hoc modo . . . Wycklef favore et diligentia Londinensium delusit suos examinatores, episcopos derisit, et evasit, . . . quando eas laicorum auribus instillavit, sed nude et aperte ut praescribuntur eas docuit, captans per talia gratiam laicorum, qui libenter audiunt, quae perversa sunt, praecipue tamen de ecclesia et personis ecclesiasticis, et libentius impelluntur ad damna vel injurias inferenda religiosis et clericis, cum aliqua opportunitas se ingesserit, quae omnino extat eis desiderabilis et votiva. P. 208.

1 Walsingham, p. 206.

2 Lewis, p. 52, (new ed. 57.)

3 Walsingham notices particularly the threats of Sir Lewis Clifford, by which they were frightened. He had in a pompous manner bid them be silent.

because it sounds harshly to sinners or to the ignorant; for then the entire faith of Scripture would be deserving of condemnation." Of course the zealots for the hierarchical party were much dissatisfied with the issue of the cause, and saw in it nothing but a yielding up of their cause on the part of the court, from motives of fear.

Wicklif's health had been shattered by his prolonged and severe labours and contests. In the year 1379 he was afflicted with a dangerous sickness. On his sick-bed he was visited by a deputation of four doctors of theology from the mendicant orders, and four senators of the city of Oxford,[1] who came to wish him the restoration of his health. Then they reminded him of the many calumnies which the mendicant friars had suffered from him, and admonished him, in view of death, to retract what he had said against them. Wicklif, who was too weak to rise from his bed, caused himself to be placed erect by his attendant, and collecting his last energies, exclaimed to the monks: "I shall not die, but live, and ever continue to expose the bad practices of the begging-monks." They left him, covered with confusion.

The dangers that threatened him, which indeed were still averted by the powerful influence of his friends, and the severe sickness which oppressed him, could not break his courage, nor deter him from the further prosecution of his bold projects of reform. It characterizes him as the forerunner of protestantism, that inasmuch as he considered the sacred Scriptures the highest and the only source of knowledge with regard to the truths of faith, and believed it necessary to examine all doctrines and determinations by this standard, he held himself justified in attacking every doctrine that could not be derived therefrom. So he felt it to be his duty to make the Bible, which to the laity was an altogether sealed book, and to the clergy of that age themselves one but little known, accessible to all as the common source of the faith, by translating it into the vernacular tongue.[2] That Wicklif was not the *only* man filled with this spirit, that the need of a more general knowledge of the Bible was at that time deeply felt *by numbers*, is evident from the fact that shortly before Wicklif, John Trevisa, a parish priest, had undertaken a translation of the Scriptures into the English language. In the year

1 Lewis, p. 64 (new ed. p. 82.) 2 Ibid., p. 66 (new ed. p. 83.)

1380, Wicklif published his translation,—a work which, as the controversies in which he thereby became involved plainly show, required a bold spirit which no danger could appal. Wicklif, it is true, could not produce a Bible in the English language to be compared with the German one afterwards produced by Luther; but we should judge of it with reference to the means then standing at his command. He could not go back to the languages of the original, being ignorant of the Hebrew and the Greek; but he spared no pains, and furnished all that it was possible to furnish with the knowledge and the helps which he possessed. Besides comparing many manuscripts of the Vulgate, he availed himself of the commentaries of Jerome and of Nicholas of Lyra, and whenever these comparisons led him to perceive a difference between the Vulgate and the original, he directed attention to the fact by marginal references. He was now attacked from various quarters, because he was introducing among the multitude a book reserved exclusively for the use of priests. But he steadfastly defended his undertaking, and so expressed himself concerning the right and the duty of laymen to draw directly, themselves, from the word of God, as could not fail to provoke against him still more violent attacks. Characteristic of these times is the way in which Henry Knighton, a contemporary who, in his History of the period, has much to say about Wicklif,[1] expresses himself on this undertaking. Nothing could furnish a more striking picture of the contrast between the spirit of Wicklif and the hierarchical spirit of the age. We hear almost the same language in this case, on Wicklif's translation of the Bible, as was used afterwards with reference to the version of Luther. Knighton says: "Master John Wicklif has translated out of Latin into English the gospel which Christ delivered to the clergy and doctors of the church, that they might administer to the laity and to weaker persons, according to the state of the times and the wants of men, in proportion to the hunger of their souls and in the way which would be most attractive to them." In these words of Knighton we recognize the prevailing view of the better class of clergy, who ever regarded themselves as tutors over the religious consciousness of the laity, and assumed it as certain, that lay-

[1] Chronica de eventibus Angliae in Histor. anglic. scriptor. antiq., Lond. 1652, tom. ii.

men must always be dependant for their religious education on the priests. The latter were to impart to them just so much of the Bible as seemed to them proper and befitting. It was an abuse of the Bible to bestow it all at once upon laymen, who were incapable of understanding it, and hence could only be led by it into error. Knighton proceeds: "Thus was the gospel by him laid more open to the laity, and to women who could read, than it had formerly been to the most learned of the clergy; and in this way the gospel pearl is cast abroad, and trodden under foot of swine."[1] He accuses Wicklif, so far as he attempted to restore the true gospel, of a design to substitute in place of the ancient one a new everlasting gospel,[2] after the manner of those sects, against which William of St Amour had written. This crime, he says, was indeed laid to the charge of those Franciscans, but it is far more applicable to the Lollards, who have rendered the gospel into our mother tongue. In defence of his translation, Wicklif said: "When so many versions of the Bible have been made, since the beginning of the faith, for the advantage of the Latins, it might surely be allowed to one poor creature of God to convert it into English, for the benefit of Englishmen." He appeals to the examples of Bede and of Alfred. Moreover, Frenchmen, Bohemians, and Britons had translated the Bible and other books of devotion into their respective languages. "I cannot see"—he says—"why Englishmen should not have the same in their language, unless it be through the unfaithfulness and negligence of the clergy, or because our people are not worthy of so great a blessing and gift of God, in punishment for their ancient sins." To those who saw something heretical in the fact that the Bible was translated into English, he replies: "They would condemn the Holy Ghost, who taught the apostles tō speak in divers tongues. He finds fault with the clergy for withholding those keys of knowledge, which had been given to them from the laity. He styles those persons heretics who affirmed that people of the world and lords had no need of knowing the law of Christ, but it was sufficient for them to know what the priests

1 Chronica de eventibus Angliae in Histor. anglic. scriptor. antiq., p. 2644.

2 Aliqui laborant ad mutandum evangelium Christi in aliud evangelium, quod dicunt fore perfectius et melius et dignius, quod appellant evangelium aeternum sive evangelium spiritus sancti.

imparted to them orally.[1] "For Holy Scripture is the faith of the church, and the more familiar they become with them, in a right believing sense, the better." He censures the clergy for taking the liberty to withhold many things contained in the Scriptures, which were against their own interest, from the laity; as, for example, whatever related to the obligation of the clergy to follow Christ in poverty and humility. All laws and doctrines of the prelates were to be received only so far as they were founded on the sacred Scriptures. As all believers must stand before the judgment seat of Christ to give account of the talents committed to them, so all should rightly know these talents and their use, in order that they may know how to render an account of them; for then no answer which must be given through a prelate or a steward could be of any avail, but each must answer in his own person. He found it necessary to show that the New Testament was intelligible to all laymen who only did what in them lay to attain to the understanding of it, in refutation of the opinion that a peculiar sort of preparation, which was possible only to the order of priests, was requisite for that purpose.[2] He extended this universal intelligibleness of the New Testament to all things the knowledge of which was necessary to salvation. The religious and moral state of recipiency, the striving after righteousness, he maintained to be the most important qualification. Whoever, said he, observes gentleness and love, he possesses the true understanding of the Holy Scriptures. He styles it a heresy to affirm that the gospel, with its truth and freedom, did not suffice for the salvation of a Christian, without the ordinances and ceremonies of sinful and ignorant men. For the rest, it is worthy of notice that Wicklif allowed himself to be carried, by his reverence for the Scriptures and his earnest endeavours to maintain their sufficiency for all purposes, beyond the measure of propriety, to fail of keeping suffi-

1 Lewis, p. 68, (new ed, p. 86.)

2 Wicklif himself relates, that at the University of Oxford it had been ordered, that priests and parsons should not read the Holy Scriptures until they had spent their nine or ten years. But it is well to observe, as characterizing the times, what the Franciscan Butler wrote twelve years later. The prelates should not tolerate it, that every man according to his inclination should be allowed to read the Bible translated into English, for this had often proved an occasion of falling into heresies. It was not politic that every man should, whenever or wherever he pleased, devote himself to the earnest study of the Bible. Lewis, p. 71, (new ed. p. 88.)

ciently distinct from each other the provinces of religious and of wordly knowledge, and to seek for the resolution of questions, which had no relation whatever to the religious needs and salvation of men in the sacred Scriptures.[1]

In the midst of these contests, Wicklif ventured to attack the doctrine of the church on a point most vitally connected with the interest of the church party—an attack, which, in these times, must have exposed him to the greatest peril. He stood forth, in the year 1381, as an opponent of the doctrine of transubstantiation. This was a necessary consequence of the relation, in which the whole bent of his own mind stood to that spirit, from which the doctrine of transubstantiation had proceeded, and which had made it triumphant. He published, in his lectures of the year 1381, twelve conclusions against this doctrine.[2]

We will, in the first place, consider more minutely his way of thinking on this subject. He attacked the doctrine of transubstantiation, and of the *accidentia sine subjecto*, on rational and on exegetical grounds. As regards the latter, he appealed to the words of institution, and held that the pronoun, "This," supposed the actual presence of the object referred to. The logical refutation connected itself with his realism, by which he was led to assume a oneness of thought and being, a harmony of correspondence between the laws of thought and the laws of creation. Hence, looking at the matter from this point of view, the *accidentia sine subjecto* appeared to him a thing inconceivable and impossible, involving a self-contradiction. In opposing the advocates of this doctrine, he says: "They pretend that they annihilate in an instant the world created by God,[3] because they destroy the primal matter which God decreed should be imperishable; and yet they can make no new thing in this world, save that they fabricate unheard of miracles,—things, which beyond any doubt would be impossible with God, (as God's almighty power has no relation to things impossible in themselves).[4] And as *they* pretend, they make a new world. But we

1 Nulla quidem est subtilitas in grammatica vel logica vel alia scientia nominanda, quin sit excellentius in scriptura. Dialog. p. 23.

2 Lewis, p. 77, (new ed. p 91.)

3 Ponunt enim, quod mundum, quem deus crearat, statim destruunt. Dialog. p. 191.

4 Vid. Wicklif's doctrine of God's omnipotence.

all suppose that God does nothing without a sufficient reason, that he does not destroy a nature which is incapable of sin, that he does not confound the ideas implanted in us by nature,[1] unless some greater advantage or some better reason exists for so doing." "What, then, could induce the Lord Jesus Christ"—says he—"so to take away from his worshippers the judgment of reason, when not a particle of good was to accrue from so doing; for it can not be proved by reason or by Scripture that such an illusion is necessary for men as an *accidens sine subjecto*, when bread and wine remaining would in a more suitable way represent the body of Christ. And there may be body and blood of Christ as well in each point of such a substance, as in any point of such a monstrous accident; and still greater reverence to God would be produced thereby."[2] He affirms that it was incongruous with Christ's nature to work a miracle of annihilation: it was contrary to the whole analogy of his miraculous works during his life on earth. Let us cite the characteristic words of Wicklif himself: "They say, in the consecration of the host, they consecrate bread and wine into nothing. But Christ, though he was called by an indolent servant a hard master, never cursed in so hard a style anything that can be named; for, when he cursed the fig-tree, it still continued to exist in its substance; for, far was it from Christ, either on account of sin or an emblem of sin,[3] to destroy utterly his own creation, and no creature can do anything, unless the agency of the Creator precedes. It is manifest that, although they bless the bread, as they say, to nothing, yet Christ preserves it, because it is his creation."[4] "The author of these falsehoods"—says he—"is not He who spake and it stood fast, but rather that lying spirit, who spake, and it ceased to be." When the determinations of the Lateran council under Innocent III. were cited as testimony in favour of the doctrine of Transubstantiation,

1 Page 193: Omnes admittimus, quod deus nihil potest facere nisi probabili ratione, nec destruit naturam impeccabilem, nec confundit notitiam naturaliter nobis datam.

2 Page 194.

3 Page 198: Propter peccatum vel figuram peccati. By the latter phrase he doubtless intended to intimate that the barrenness of the fig tree was emblematical of the moral barrenness of the Jewish people.

4 Patet, ut consonat, quod licet ipsi benedicant panem, ut false dicunt, in nihilum, tamen Christus, cum sit sua fabrica, ipsum servat.

he replied: Although Innocent may have taught such an insane fiction as the monks affirm, still this can make out nothing against the truth which is founded on the gospel; for it is from this source all truth must be derived, and especially that truth which relates to our faith.[1] He alludes to the fact that he had sent to the satraps (the prelates) three theses: First, if by the power of those sacramental words, an "accident without a subject" was posited in the sacrament of the altar, then the sacrament itself also was an accident; secondly, there had never, from the beginning, been a more monstrous heresy than this; thirdly, this sacrament was in a natural way true bread, and truly the body of Christ.[2]

With regard to Wicklif's own view of the Lord's Supper, it may be remarked, that he contended against every mode of a bodily presence of Christ, every mode of conceiving a strict and proper connection of body and blood with the bread and wine. He contended against that earlier view set forth by John of Paris, of a so-called *impanation*, the view that in virtue of a union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine like the union of the two natures in Christ, the predicates of the one might be transferred over to the other. He affirmed that bread and wine are called body and blood of Christ only in a symbolical sense, as in general one thing may, in an improper sense, be called by the name of another. But he regarded it as being not merely a *representative*, but also an *active* symbol for believers; that the symbols were actually that which they represented in a certain relation, *habitudinaliter*, that is, insomuch that believers, who partook of the holy supper with true devotion, were thereby placed in a real union with Christ. He endeavoured to prove this by comparing the language with other similar modes of expression in the Scriptures. "Homely examples"—he says—"may be adduced in illustration. It is not required, but contradicts the truth, to say that a man, by becoming a lord or a prelate of the church, ceases to be the same person, when he continues to

1 Et esto, quod Innocentius III. deviavit in ista dementia, ut fratres sibi imponunt; scio tamen ex fide Christi, quod quicquid in materia ista definierit, non debet acceptari a fidelibus, nisi de quanto in lege evangelica est fundatum, cum certus sum ex eadem fide, quod in ista lege omnis veritas et specialiter veritas fidei secundum mensuram, quae magis congruit, continetur. Dial. p. 196.

2 Ibid. p. 197.

be the same, although, in a certain sense, more exalted substance. So we should believe that the bread, through the power of the sacramental words in virtue of the consecration by the high priest, becomes truly Christ's body. The substance of the bread is not thereby destroyed but exalted to a nobler substance.[1] Do we really believe that John the Baptist, when he was by the power of Christ's word made Elias, ceased thereby to be John, or anything that he in substance was before? In like manner, it is not required to say that the bread, although it began to be the body of Christ by the power of his words, therefore ceased to be bread." Both might so subsist together, that Christ might call John Elias, and yet John might say he was not Elias. "For the one means" —says he—"that John is Elias in a figurative sense, and the other, that he is not Elias in person." After the same analogy the bread, if one speaks in the proper sense, is *not*, and yet, in the symbolic sense, it is the body of Christ; it is only necessary to distinguish the different senses in which a thing is affirmed or denied.[2] He cites in proof the case that Christ, with a certain reference, is called by the apostle Paul, 1 Cor. x., a rock; and that, according to the 41st chapter of Genesis, the seven ears of corn and the seven fat kine were seven fruitful years,—not that they represented, but that they were these years.[3]

He observes that there are three modes of being, that may be attributed to the body of Christ,—his being in heaven, in the world generally, and in the holy supper. We should not represent the matter as if that which is represented by something else in a certain relation, *habitudinaliter*, came to it by some motion in space, or as if an actual change took place by some process taking place in the thing represented. We should not conceive that the body of Christ descends to the host, which is consecrated in a particular church; but it remains above, fixed and unmoved, in heaven. Hence that body is present in the host spiritually, not dimensionally, as in heaven. Christ is spiritually present, as man, in every part of the world. Yet, in the consecrated host,

1 Cum natura panis non ex hinc destruitur, sed in digniorem substantiam exaltatur. P. 190.

2 Et conformiter non contradicunt, sed aequivocant qui concedunt, quod hoc sacramentum non est, supple, naturaliter corpus Christi, et idem sacramentum est figuraliter corpus Christi. Ibid.

3 Ibid. p. 200.

Christ is present in a far different manner, since he is, *habitudinaliter*, the very host itself. And in relation to spiritual being and potential being he is still, again, differently present in every part of the same. And thus it is evident, that in a twofold respect the body of Christ is in the place of the consecrated host.[1]

Thus it may be explained, how Wicklif, in an English confession, could honestly say: "I acknowledge that the sacrament of the altar is verily God's body in the form of bread; but it is God's body after a different manner than that body is in heaven."[2] We see how in Wicklif, the denying of the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist, under the supposition of a merely spiritual presence, is connected with too sensuous a representation of heaven, and of the nature of the glorified body of Christ, when he says: "In heaven is his foot in the form of flesh and blood; but in the sacrament is God's body, by a miracle of God, in the form of bread." How it is that although Christ is not corporeally present, yet faith must fasten only on him, he illustrates as follows: "As one thinks not of the material of which a statue is made, whether it be made of oak or of ash, and fixes his thoughts only on that of which it is the figure, so and still more, one should be far from thinking of the species of bread, but he should think only on Christ, and with all the purity, all the devotion, and all the love, which God pleased to give him, reverence Christ; and then he receives God spiritually to more effect than the priest who chants the mass with less charity."[3]

Wicklif says himself, in a passage of his Trialogue, that he was certain of the negatives, viz., that the doctrine of transubstantiation and the doctrine of the *accidentibus sine subjecto*, could not be true; more uncertain of the positive side, how it was necessary to conceive the relation of the consecrated bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ. Hence may be explained how it should happen that he does not always express himself exactly

1 Ibid. p. 204.

2 Lewis, p. 285 (new ed. p. 335.)

3 Lewis, p. 285 (new ed. p. 335): As a man leeves for to thenk the kinde of an ymage whether it be of oke or of ashe, and settys his thought in him in whom is the ymage: so myche more schuld a man leve tho thenk on the kynde of brede, but thenk upon Christ; and with alle cleness, alle devotion, and alle charitye that God wolde gif him worschippe he Crist, and then he receives God ghostly more meedfully than the prist that syngus the masse in less charity. For the bodely etyng ne profites nouth to soule, but in alsmykul as the soule is fedde with charity.

alike on this doctrine. To contend against the sensuous tendency to set forth the spiritual union with Christ as the principal thing, he ever regarded as the point of greatest importance, and this predominant interest in favour of the spiritual mode of apprehension, may in fact have led him into many false interpretations. Remarkable is the way in which he expresses himself on this subject, in an English work of his, entitled the Wickett (door to the Christian life).[1] He here affirms Scripture does not say, that Christ at the institution blessed the bread and wine, but it seems on the contrary, that he blessed his disciples, whom he had appointed to be witnesses of his life-giving sufferings, and in them he left his blessed word, which is the bread of life; as it is written, that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. And so Christ had called himself the bread of life that came down from heaven, and Christ, in the Gospel of Matthew (he means no doubt the gospel of John), often says, the words which I speak to you are spirit and life. Hence it seems rather that he blessed his disciples, than the bread and wine; for in them was the bread of life left, much more than in the material bread and wine.[2] For the material bread is a perishable thing, Matthew xv. 17; for the blessing of Christ preserved his apostles spiritually and bodily at the same time; where he cites Christ's promise that no one of his disciples should be lost except Judas. Christ says not this bread is my body, or, that the bread should be given for the life of the world,—where it appears that Wicklif did not refer the pronoun "This" to the bread, but as Carlstadt afterwards seems to have done, to Christ's body.[3] And in proof of the assertion that all depends here upon the spirit, not upon the flesh, he cites the words of Christ in John vi. 63; and next the words in John xii. 24; "From these words"—he adds—"we may perceive that

1 Wycklyffes Wycket, whych he made in King Richard's days the second, published at Nüremberg, 1546, then afterwards reprinted at the University of Oxford, 1828, which edition lies here before us.

2 Wyckot, p. 15: Therfore it semeth more that he blessed his disciples, and also his apostles, in whom the bread of lyfe was lefte more then in materiall breade.

3 And often the scripture saith, that Jesu toke breade and brake it and gave it to his disciples and sayd, take ye eat ye, this is my bodye that shalbe geven for you. But he sayd not this bread is my body, or that the brede shuld be geven for the lyfe of the world.

Christ according to the flesh must die, and that in his death is given the fruit of eternal life for all who believe in him."

Wicklif even declares with great vehemence, his opposition to that doctrine of "the accidents without a subject," which to him seemed so much at variance with the bible and with reason. He represents it as one of Satan's most cunning manœuvres, to succeed in persuading men to believe this monstrous doctrine. He thus expresses himself on the subject in his Trialogue.[1] "The cunning craft of Satan strove a long time to work up this delusion, to mislead the church into this heresy." He represents Satan as saying: "If by my representative the antichrist, I can so far lead astray the faithful of the church, that they shall hold this sacrament to be no longer bread, but an abominable accident, I shall by that very thing lead them afterwards to believe whatever I will." He means that by the same analogy, it might be said to the communities, "In whatever vices a prelate may live, yet this should never be believed of him by the people his subjects. He would say that, by this analogy, those dignities of the clergy which are to be reverenced by laymen, may be retained in spite of all their crimes, if every thing was to be considered as an accident without a subject."

He denominates the adoration of the host a species of idolatry. When it was objected, that this adoration was not paid to the host but to Christ, he replied: "The same may be said of any creature, which, according to this doctrine, should therefore be adored; for it is certain, that in every creature is the trinity, and that is something far more perfect than the body of Christ."[2] Yet Wicklif does not reject altogether the custom of adoration in this regard, since he says: "Still we adore this host, according to the faith of scripture, in a way more safely warranted, and so also the cross of our Lord, or other images made by men."

Wicklif went to such a length in his altogether too dogmatical zeal as to regard this doctrine both as an invention of Satan and also as an error incompatible with the existence of saving faith: and believed it necessary to suppose that those advocates of this doctrine, whom he would not willingly cut off from salva-

1 Lib. iv. p. 201.

2 Quia certum est, quod in qualibet creatura est trinitas increata, et illa est longè perfectior quam est corpus Christi. P. 202.

tion, as for example, Robert, bishop of Lincoln, venerated by him as a witness for the truth, must, before their departure, have come to the knowledge of this heresy, and repented of it.[1] We recognize here that one-sided dogmatic tendency of protestantism, which is inclined to lay an undue stress on formal conceptions. But at the same time we should carefully keep in mind, that before men were in a condition to understand the real historical process of development of the religious life and its relation to doctrine, they must have been quite incapable of understanding the relative necessity of certain doctrinal modes of expression for certain times, in a certain spiritual atmosphere, though such modes of expression, objectively considered, may be incorrect.

Having thus thrown a glance at Wicklif's doctrine of the Lord's supper, we now return back to the history. In the year 1381, then, Wicklif put forth the following theses on the Lord's supper: "The right faith of a Christian is this, that this commendable sacrament is bread and body of Christ, as Christ is true God and true man; and this faith is founded on Christ's own words in the Gospels." He adverts to the testimony of the church fathers, and characterizes this faith as perfectly consonant with reason. He adduces the proofs in confirmation of it from the epistles of St Paul. He calls upon the secular lords to defend this faith, as they were bound to do on peril of their salvation.

The case, however, was quite different with Wicklif's attack on the doctrine of transubstantiation, from what it had been with his previous contests. When he attacked the tyranny and the vices of the clergy, of the mendicants, he could reckon on a host of allies, even such as did not agree with him in his dogmatic convictions. But here the question related to the weightiest doctrines of the church, the opponents of which had long since been condemned as heretics. The chancellor of the University of Oxford called together twelve doctors, and with their concurrence, published a solemn judgment, declaring the theses put forth by Wicklif on the doctrine of transubstantiation to be heretical; and the preaching of these views were forbidden on penalty of imprisonment and the infliction of the ban. Wicklif,

1 Multos autem suppono seductos fuisse hac haeresi, qui finaliter poenitebant, ut suppono de domino Lincolniensi. P. 198.

however, did not allow himself to be disturbed by this proceeding, but boldly told the chancellor that neither he nor any other member of his council would be able to point out anything heretical in him. Then following out his principles respecting the relation of the church to the state, he made his appeal to the king.

Meanwhile, through the spread of Wicklif's principles, and owing to the impulse he had communicated and the influence of his party, which extended in various ways through the different ranks of society, to the very lowest, various foreign, secular, and political elements entered into the fermentation that had been produced, which threatened a catastrophe. There were appearances similar to those which started up amidst the Donatist movements in North Africa, and in the peasant war connected with the German reformation. These movements seem to have sprung up originally independent of Wicklif's influence, direct or indirect, and to have been owing to other causes. The manifold oppressions of the country people called forth powerful reactions, and a little spark might grow into a large fire. The spirit that revolted against oppression brought on a disposition to resist all regular authority, and to reduce everything to a level. These movements do not seem even to have stood so closely connected with the reformatory tendency proceeding from Wicklif as the disturbances of the later peasant war in Germany stood with the ideas diffused by Luther, and misapprehended by some of the people. Still, the reformatory elements set in motion by Wicklif might enter into combination with reformatory movements of quite another character, relating purely to political matters; and the attacks on the power and rule of a corrupt clergy called forth by Wicklif, might present somewhat the appearance of a common cause. Add to this, that men of a violent and fanatical spirit of reform placed themselves, at this time—like those enthusiasts attacked by Luther in his later days, the leaders of the people in the peasant war,—at the head of the excited people, or espoused their cause with visionary expectations. We cannot say that such men had been first roused by the impulse which proceeded from Wicklif, that they had first received and afterwards further developed the seeds which he scattered abroad. A man from whom some

great movement proceeds seldom stands alone. Generally there is some common element in the spiritual atmosphere, which brings such men upon the public stage, though minds of a kindred bent show themselves sometimes pure, sometimes the reverse; in some cases, full of good sense; in others, extravagant and fanatical. So it seems to have been with the reformatory movements and elements of rebellion against the hierarchy which appeared in England at the present time. There was a priest, John Balle, chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury, not from Wicklif's school, nor first aroused by Wicklif's influence; for, before the latter came upon the public stage, this person had already created a sensation by his preaching.[1] This man seems not to have started, like Wicklif, from a determinate dogmatic tendency opposed to the dominant church system, but to have embarked in his undertakings merely as a practical reformer. Perhaps he appeared first as one of the preachers of repentance in those times, and vigorously attacked the reigning vices and immoralities of the day, understood how to work on the passions of the people, had many followers, and was thus carried along from one step to another. He inveighed especially against the vices prevailing among the clergy and the nobility. This pleased the people.[2] He declaimed against the superfluity of wealth among the clergy, spoke of their growing rich at the people's cost. Tythes—he said—ought not to be paid to parsons, when those that paid them were poorer than the parsons. Neither ought tythes or oblations to be paid, when it was evident that the laity led better lives than the parsons.[3] He seems to have been zealous against the unchastity of the clergy, and probably remonstrated as the representatives of the Hildebrandian reformatory spirit had formerly done; against the practice of allowing

1 Knighton says concerning Wicklif's relations with him: Hic habuit praecursorem Johannem Balle, veluti Christus Johannem baptistam, qui vias suas in talibus opinionibus praeparavit. Hist. angl. script. tom. ii., p. 2644.

2 Knighton, his violent opponent, says of him: Qui praedicator famosissimus habebatur apud laïcos, qui per plura retroacta tempora verbum dei insipienter sparserat, lollium cum tritico immiscendo, laïcis nimis placens. P. 2634. When this opponent says of him, that he mixed tares with the good fruit in his sermons, it would seem that even his enemy must find something to commend in him, which may refer to his practical exhortations.

3 Walsingham, p. 275.

illegitimate sons of clergymen to obtain spiritual promotion.[1] In all this, as appears evident from what has been said, he presented numerous points of contact with Wicklif, which, however, is no proof of any farther relationship of spirit, or connection between the two men. Neither is it certain that John Balle, at any later period, embraced Wicklif's doctrines. For when his opponents, who were also the fierce opponents of Wicklif, say that he disseminated Wicklif's doctrines among the people,[2] still this amounts to no proof that he did so. After having thus wielded an influence over the people for a considerable time, he was finally arrested, and, to their great chagrin, cast into prison at Canterbury. Meanwhile insurrection spread far and wide among the populace. The possessions of the archbishop were attacked. And it is a noticeable fact, though one that has often occurred at other times, that men, impelled by a wild spirit of fanaticism, men, who in other respects indulged themselves in every species of abomination, wishing to appear only as champions for justice and liberty, would allow of no theft, no robbery to gratify private avarice. These mobs had attacked a castle belonging to the Duke of Lancaster. He was particularly unpopular with them. And yet we have seen that this duke was Wicklif's ancient patron—which shows, again, that there could not have been any connection between these two different movements. On this occasion one of the mob stole a beautiful vessel of silver, which he wished to retain for himself; but his companions tossed him and the vase into the flames, crying: We are not thieves and robbers, but zealots for truth and justice![3] By this insurrectionary mob Balle was liberated from his dungeon and received with enthusiasm as a martyr. He stood up as a preacher before an audience of thousands, and added fuel to the flame. The multitude wanted to make him their archbishop and chancellor. One sentence in a sermon of his which he preached before a mob composed of two

1 That is, if we may gather this from the words of Walsingham, which, coming from the lips of so violent an antagonist, are not to be taken in so literal a sense. Perhaps they state his own conclusion from a fact, rather than the fact as it really was. His words are: Docuit etiam neminem aptum regno dei, qui non in matrimonio natus fuisset.

2 As Walsingham says: Docuit et perversa dogmata perfidi Johannis Wicklef.

3 Knighton, p. 2635.

hundred thousand people, characterizes the man: "When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman?"[1] He then went on to prove that by nature all were created equal; bondage had been introduced only by sinful men, subjugating others, in opposition to God's will; for, if it had pleased God to create serfs, he would have determined, in the beginning of the world, who should be a serf and who a freeman. They should consider, then, he said to the assembled crowd, that the time had now come, when, casting off the yoke of servitude, they could enjoy the long desired liberty. Therefore he exhorted them to behave as men of understanding. And from love to the Father of the house, who purges the field from tares, they should feel bound also to do the same now; first, putting to death the lords and nobles of the realm, then the judges and jurists, next, all whom they knew would in any other way do mischief to the commonwealth. Then, and not till then, would they secure to themselves peace and freedom for the future, when there was equal liberty, dignity, and authority among them all. John Balle afterwards fell a victim to his fanaticism; he was taken prisoner and executed as a rebel. This insurrection of the peasantry, which led to great havoc and destruction, was finally put down by force. Now, although, as is evident, all this was a thing quite foreign from the spirit of Wicklif, yet it was eagerly seized upon afterwards by his enemies, as a pretext for connecting the aims and intentions of the so-called Lollards, with the object proposed by those disturbances. Many of Wicklif's disciples among the clergy and the knights, disciples among the clergy who did not conduct their labours with the prudence of their master, and who manifested in their sermons too violent a zeal for reform, may have contributed to this result.

Wicklif himself meddled too much with reform beginning from without,—a spirit which passed over, also, to the party he founded. And this circumstance would contribute, still more, to place his cause in a false light. He presented to the parliament a paper, in which he proposed that the king and the realm should obey prelates only so far as, according to the teaching of Scripture, such obedience belonged to the obedience of Christ; because

[1] Walsingham, p. 275: Wahn Adam dalfe and Eve span, who was than a gentleman?

otherwise Christ must obey antichrist. For there was no neutral ground between Christ and antichrist. All obedience should be paid solely to Christ; and any act of obedience not paid to him, must therefore be paid to antichrist. He cites, in proof, Christ's words: "He that is not for me is against me." That the money of the kingdom should be sent neither to the court of Rome, nor to Avignon, nor to any other foreign power, unless it were proved that men are bound to do so from Holy Scripture. That neither a cardinal, nor any other man, had a right to enjoy the fruits of an English church, unless he duly resided there, or was lawfully employed in prosecuting some affair of the realm, which had been approved by the nobles. For he would else not enter in through Christ, but as a disciple of antichrist; and by human ordinances he would plunder the kingdom, like a robber, among the poor under his power, without returning any equivalent for the money obtained. That the king and the realm should be bound to extirpate the traitors of the realm, and to defend their own against cruel enemies. That the common weal of the realm should not be burdened with inordinate taxes, until the patrimony, with which the clergy was endowed, was exhausted; for that was all property of the poor, to be used for their benefit in the spirit of charity; as it would be, if the clergy lived in the perfection of primitive poverty. If any bishop or parish priest fell knowingly into the contempt of God, the king was not only warranted but also bound to confiscate the temporal goods of such bishop or priest; otherwise he would neglect the realm.[1] That the king should employ no bishop or priest in secular affairs; as well king as clergyman would otherwise be Christ's betrayer. That the king should cause no person to be arrested because he remained under excommunication, till it should be proved by the law of God that he remained justly under excommunication; for many had been excommunicated through haste and imprudence, in cases where, according to the laws of God and the church, they ought not to have suffered excommunication. To arrest a man, when he did his whole duty, was a work of the devil. The contrary, though its consequences might be neither felt nor cared for, yet reduced the state

[1] Christum regis domini temporalis contemptum ponderans.

to great confusion; for an evil which is not felt, and which is therefore considered a trifle and little thought of, draws after it consequences only so much the more disastrous.[1]

The insurrection of the peasants had another injurious effect on Wicklif's cause, that in the same year, 1381, the milder archbishop of Canterbury, Simon Sudbury, was murdered, and William Courtney, bishop of London, a man inclined to more violent measures, one of the fiercest opponents of Wicklif, was appointed his successor to the see of Canterbury. This prelate now took advantage of his power to proceed more vigorously against Wicklif. But the latter appealed to parliament, and in his memorial proposed that all persons entangled in private religions devised by sinful men, should be left free to adopt, without molestation, the law of Christ alone, which, having been given by Christ to his apostles, was far more perfect than any such religion invented by sinful men. That all who had unreasonably and wrongfully condemned this whole counsel given by Christ should be corrected on account of so gross an error, and the same publicly made known. That tithes and oblations should be given and received to the end which God's law and the ordinances of the pope had determined; and for the same reason they should be taken away, namely in all cases where they were not used conformably to their original design. Christ's doctrine of the holy supper should be publicly taught in the churches; and the opposite doctrine, which had been set up by accursed hypocrites and heretics, and by worldly priests ignorant of God's law, [*should be rejected.*] The last three words were not found in the MSS. used by Lewis, and are therefore supplied by conjecture.[2]

Wicklif had, in the meantime, ever since his return from Bruges, become more bold and violent every day in his attacks upon the mendicants. In a paper put forth about this time (1382), he affirms that he could point out fifty heresies, and more, in their orders. He attacked them as promoters of human ordinances to the injury of divine truth. He sought to show that their whole mode of life was one at variance with the example of Christ; that by their vows Christian liberty was

[1] Walsingham, p. 283.

[2] Lewis, p. 84, (new ed. p. 98.)

abridged; and, in a time when men were incapable of examining for themselves, obligations were imposed on them which they could not fulfil; that men would thus be diverted from the most wholesome sort of labour after the example of Christ, that of preaching Christ's gospel where it was most needed, without being confined to any single spot. He accused them of disturbing the parish priests in the labours of their calling.[1] While, however, in other contests with this party, Wicklif could reckon upon powerful patrons, the case was altered in this controversy on so weighty a doctrine.

To the Duke of Lancaster, Wicklif's old patron, this step of the reformer was extremely unwelcome. It is said that he went himself, in person, to Oxford, for the purpose of advising Wicklif against this course, and of persuading him not to meddle with these things. But Wicklif was not so to be persuaded to give up a particle of the truth which he had advanced; and we see that although he availed himself of such aid of the powerful as might offer itself, in opposing the hierarchy, and although he would gladly have joined himself with the civil power, yet it was far from any thoughts of his, to place reliance on these helps, and to begin the battle on this reliance. He bravely persevered, even when he saw his old patrons declaring against him. Courtney, the new archbishop of Canterbury, convoked on the 17th of May, in a Franciscan monastery in London, a council to examine into Wicklif's affair. The proceedings were interrupted by an earthquake; for which reason Wicklif was wont to call this assembly derisively the earthquake-council.[2] He regarded the event as a judgment of God in favour of his doctrine. He says, in his later confession:[3] "The council charged Christ and the saints with a heresy; hence the earth trembled and shook, and a strong voice answered in the place of God, as it happened at the time of the last passion of Christ (John xii.), when he was condemned to bodily death."[4] The archbishop, however, encouraged the prelates by explaining the fact as a divine judgment of the opposite kind—a notification that, as nature was purified, by such shocks,

1 Lewis, p. 20 (new ed. p. 30.)

2 Lewis, p. 95 (new ed. p. 117.)

3 Knighton, p. 2650.

4 Wherefore the erthe tremblide fayland maynnus voys ansveryde for God als it d de in tyme of his passione whan he was dampnyde to bodely deth.

of poisonous exhalations, so the church was to be purified of the venom of heresy. By this council a number of Wicklif's propositions were condemned, either as heretical or erroneous; partly, such as he had actually affirmed, for example, on the Lord's supper; on the limits of ecclesiastical and civil power; on what belongs to the right discharge of the duties of clergymen; in opposition to the secularization of the church and of the papacy; on the papal dignity, in its right sense, being conditioned upon the personal character of the person administering it.[1] The archbishop put forth an ordinance against the Wicklifite doctrines, addressed to the chancellor of Oxford University, to which, however, the University at first paid but very little attention.[2] But the archbishop induced King Richard to issue a command, directing that all persons who there taught Wicklifite doctrines, should be placed under arrest.[3] Wicklif speaks of the secret plots in London and Lincoln, to kill off the poor priests.[4] After this he published a new confession on the subject of the Lord's supper, in which he took pains to guard against the insinuation that he did not acknowledge the true body of Christ in the sacrament; though he by no means retracted his opinions, but so expressed himself that there could be no difficulty in recognizing them in this new form. He declared,[5] very decidedly, against the doctrine of transubstantiation; inveighed against those whom he calls the sect of accident-worshippers, and after having spoken of the prevailing errors, concludes by saying: "But I believe the truth will finally conquer." He defended himself, in a particular tract, against the so-called earthquake-council. With regard to many of the doctrines which had been condemned there, he could with perfect justice declare, that he had never preached them. Others, which he had really taught, he defended against the imputation of heresy. He cleared himself, for example, from the charge that he had made the objective validity of the sacraments depend on the subjective character of the person who

1 Wicklif says of these judgments of the council, the mendicants have poisoned the kingdom of England at their earthquake-council in London. Dial. 292.

2 Walsingham, p. 286.

3 Wilkins concilia magn. Brit. Lond. 1737, tom. iv., p. 156.

4 Quod tam Londiniae quam Lincolniae laborarunt assidue, ad sacerdotes fideles et pauperes exstinguendum. Dialog. p. 296.

5 Lewis, p. 272, (new ed. p. 323.)

administered them. Sophisters ought to know that even a reprobate might still perform fully the sacramental acts, though it would be to his own condemnation; for they are not the authors of these sacraments, but God reserves in his own hands that divine power on which the efficacy of sacraments depends.[1] With prayer, however, the case was quite different. In the seventh proposition condemned under his name, the assertion was ascribed to him, that a people may punish their sinning rulers according to their own good pleasure. On this point Wicklif, in defending himself, remarks: "This charge is inserted in calumniation of the poor priests, with a view to make them odious to the secular lords; when the truth is that the poor priests do their utmost to counteract, by the divine law, the insurrection of servants against their lords, and declare to servants their obligation to obey their masters, even though they may be tyrants. In the paper in which he examines the articles condemning his doctrines,[2] he persists in affirming that, according to the divine word, the king was bound to deprive the clergy of the goods which they abused.

The movements in Oxford induced Wicklif to retire in the same year, 1382, to his parish at Lutterworth. He was there seized with a paralysis. But his courage and zeal suffered no abatement under this affliction. He kept on contending to the very last. Meantime broke out the papal schism of which we have spoken. The enfeebling effect of this event on the papal power was favourable to Wicklif's cause; and he understood well how to avail himself of the divided opinions on the question who was pope, and of the quarrel between the two popes, to back up his attack on the papacy itself, and his arguments against the necessity of a visible supreme head of the church. Accordingly, in a paper on the schism he says:[3] "Trust we in the help of Christ on this point, for he hath begun already to help us graciously, in that he hath clove the head of antichrist, and made the two parts fight one against the other. For it is not doubtful that the sin of the popes, which hath been so long

1 Lewis, p. 96, (new ed. p. 118): Sophisters shulden know well that a cursed man doth fully the sacraments, though it be to his damning, for they ben not autours of these sacraments, but God kepeth that divinity to himself.

2 The great sentence of curse expounded, Lewis, p. 99, (new ed. p. 121.)

3 Vaughan, vol ii., p. 5.

continued, hath brought in this division." He says, "Let the rival pontiffs continue to launch their anathemas against each other, or should one of them prevail, in either case a severe wound has been inflicted. He calls upon the emperor and kings to lend their assistance in this cause, to maintain God's law, to recover the heritage of the church, and to destroy the foul sins of clerks, saving their persons. Thus would peace be established, and simony destroyed. He contests the pretended infallibility of the popes, and denies their arrogant pretensions with regard to absolutism and indulgence.[1] In a work still unpublished "On the church and its government," after speaking of the prevalence of simony in the church, he says: "And so God would no longer suffer the fiend to reign in only one such priest, but for the sin which they had done made division among two, so that men, in Christ's name, may the more easily overcome them both. Evil is weakened by diffusion, no less than good; and this now moveth poor priests to speak heartily in this matter." In his sermons preached at Lutterworth, he made frequent allusions to the schism; thus in a sermon on Romans xiii., when he says, "The pope is not on Christ's side, who put his soul for his sheep, but on the side of antichrist who putteth many souls for his pride. This man feedeth not the sheep of Christ, as Christ thrice commanded Peter, but spoileth them and slayeth them, and leadeth them many wrong ways."

The bull proclaiming a crusade and indulgence, and put forth by pope Urban VI. against his rival Clement VII. in Avignon, afforded Wicklif occasion for many new and fierce assaults on the popes, in which he exposed the unchristian character of this procedure, and the futility of the proclamation of indulgence.[2] In the paper above mentioned, which contains a criticism of the sentences of condemnation passed on his doctrines, he reproaches the pope for using the banner of the cross, that symbol of peace, of grace and of charity, to lead men on to the destruction of Christians, from love to two false priests, open antichrists, in order to maintain their worldly state, and oppress Christendom. And he asks: "Why is not the proud priest in Rome willing to grant full pardon to all men when they live in peace, charity,

1 Vaughan, vol. ii., p. 6. 2 Lewis, p. 99 (new ed. p. 121.)

and patience, as he grants it to all who will engage in the work of destroying Christians?" When cited by the pope to appear before his tribunal in Rome, he published a bold letter to him, expressing his views openly. He declares that believing the gospel, as he did, to be the supreme rule, higher than all other laws, he considered the pope as bound above all men to keep this law, being the highest representative of Christ on earth. For the greatness of Christ's representative, was not to be measured by the standard of worldly greatness, but by the degree in which a person represents Christ by a virtuous life. He supposes that Christ, during his life on earth, was the poorest of men. No Christian should follow the pope or any saint in heaven, except so far as such an one follows Christ. "For"—says he—"James and John were in error, and Peter and Paul sinned." He exhorts the pope, therefore, to surrender his secular rule to secular lords, and he would soon induce all his clergy to do the same; for so had Christ done and taught his disciples to do, till the evil fiend blinded this world. So far as it depended on himself he was ready to go to Rome; but Christ had bid him do the contrary, and taught him to obey God rather than man. "And I hope"—he writes—"of our pope, that he will be no antichrist nor act in direct contradiction to the will of Christ; for if he cites me against reason, and this unreasonable citation is followed up, then he is an open antichrist." An honest intention did not suffice to excuse Peter, nor prevent Christ from calling him Satan; so in the present case a blind intention and bad counsel would not serve to excuse the pope. But when he required poor priests to undertake a journey which was beyond their means, this could not be excused by the pious intention, nor so as to prevent his being called antichrist. God tempts no man beyond what he is able to bear; why should a man require such a service from another? "Therefore"—he concludes—"we pray God in behalf of our Pope Urban VI. that his holy purpose of old may not be hindered and frustrated by the fiend. And Christ, who cannot lie, says, that the fiend of man is in his own house."[1]

While Wicklif was hearing mass on the day of the Holy Innocents, in the year 1384, in his church at Lutterworth, he fell

1 Lewis, letter of excuse to pope Urban VI., p. 283, (new ed. p. 333.)

down just as the host was elevated, struck by a violent shock of apoplexy; his tongue was so palsied that he could not speak till he died. This event took place on Silvester eve.

We will now proceed to the exposition of Wicklif's doctrine. His philosophy and theology were closely interwoven; accordingly the antagonism of realism and nominalism entered deeply also into his theology.[1] Nominalism in fact appeared to him something heretical. It was by reason of this false confounding together of the provinces of philosophy and theology, that he accused the nominalists of necessarily misrepresenting the truth of Holy Scripture; since, in the history of the creation of the species, they could not receive the account in its true sense, but must understand it as speaking of *names*, without real substance.[2] He took ground decidedly against those who held to an opposition between truths philosophical and truths theological. He calls it infatuation to assert that any light of nature is at variance with the light of faith, so that in the light of faith it may be necessary to believe what in the light of nature is impossible. He held that such blindness was in reality no *light* of nature, but darkness; since two such contradictory lights could not possibly exist together.[3] But since the fall, a certain imperfection cleaves to the weak light of nature which God graciously remedies by imparting his own knowledge to mankind. And accordingly one man discovers by the light of nature, what another comes to know by the light of faith. Starting from his realism, Wicklif affirms a correspondence between truth in *thought* and *being* as it is grounded in God. Men may frame to themselves many thoughts which do not correspond to being;—thoughts of things which are in themselves impossible; but these are no true thoughts. There is no actual reception of the substance of such thoughts into the soul, but a reception merely of their signs, a presentation of mere words. He distinguishes, as a realist, the *intelligere res* from the

1 In support of his doctrine of the reality of general conceptions he appeals to Aristotle; still more profound, however, appears to him Plato's doctrine of ideas. He says: Certum est, quod sunt universalia ex parti rei testificata tam ab Aristotele, quam Platone. Licet Plato subtilius ascendit in universalia idearum. Dial. p. 41.

2 Et species in Mose sonuerat in principio libri sui, vocans rerum creaturarum principia species et genera, ut patet in principio genesis, quam indubie species intellexit non esse terminos, vel conceptus, sicut somniant haeretici, exponentes fidem scripturae ad sensum, quem spiritus sanctus non flagitat. Ibid. p. 42.

3 Quia non talia duo lumina repugnantia. Ibid. p. 16.

mere *signa rerum, verba cogitans.*[1] But this cannot be transferred to God. Everything posited in his ideas is in ideal being one with himself;[2] hence that only is possible which is actual, though men may conceive of many things as possible, which in fact are not possible.[3] Men may represent to themselves many monstrous things, to which no ideas in God correspond; but God can know nothing which is not God himself, or in some way ideally represented in God.[4] Everything positive in the creature must be referred to God; God himself produces it, though not in the form in which it is produced by finite creatures.[5] He defends, against Aristotle, the Platonic doctrine of ideas. He finds in Aristotle a misapprehension of the nature of ideas, since by them is not to be understood anything self-subsistent; the term, in his view, denotes the form in which God knows things, the *intellectualitas creaturæ*. The idea is, in its essence, God himself; in its form, it is the mode in which God knows created things.[6] With his doctrine of ideas accordingly is connected the proposition, that whatever is possible is actual.[7] He denies the existence in God of any such distinction as that of power or faculty and action; omnipotence, therefore, relates only to what actually takes place. And as God can produce nothing in himself which he does not actually produce, so he can produce nothing without himself which he does not actually bring forth in its proper time.[8]

We see in Wicklif the tendency of reform combined with an Augustinianism which went far beyond Augustin himself in its polemical hostility to everything that seemed verging on Pelagian-

1 Sed quamvis homo vel diabolus possunt intelligere sic erronee, cum nec sua intellectio nec apparentia terminatur ad rem apparentem vel intellectam extra signum. Dial. p. 116.

2 Ibid. p. 8.

3 He supposes quod est and quod potest esse to be identical, quia omne quod habet esse intelligibile, est in deo. Omne significabile foret secundum esse intelligibile ipse deus.

4 Deus non potest quicquam intelligere, nisi sit ipse deus, vel in deo aliqualiter ideatum. P. 10.

5 Deus facit omne positivum, quod creatura sua fecerit, et tamen ex hoc non sequitur, quod comedat, loquatur et ambulet cæt. P. 14.

6 P. 25: Idea est essentialiter natura divina, et formaliter ratio secundum quam deus intelligit creaturas.

Deus nihil intelligit, nisi quod existit, dum potest existere, et sic omne quod existere potest, existit. P. 26.

Sicut deus ad intra nihil potest producere, nisi absolute necessario illud producat, sic nihil ad extra potest producere, nisi pro suo tempore illud producat. P. 28.

ism; to all worth or ability on the part of the creature; and which, in fact, amounted to the denial of free-will. A one-sided religious element in Wicklif, here united itself with his stern speculative consistency: we meet with elements which in their logical evolution would have led to pantheism. Everything, according to his notions, enters as a part necessarily into the fulfilment of the decrees of predestination. This excludes all conditions. No falling away from grace, therefore, is possible, because grace is a thing grounded in the divine predestination; although for a transient moment a predestinated person may sin, and for a transient moment a reprobate partake of grace. In the developments of time, the fact that the one is a *praescitus*, the other a *praedestinatus*, is conditioned on the sinful life of the one and the pious life of the other; but the original eternal ground of all is still the divine predestination, which is made actual by all temporal instrumentalities; for all is grounded in the divine ideas, which are one with God himself. To the harmony of the world, to which God makes everything relate, belong, according to the notions of Wicklif, both good and evil.[1] It may be conceded, that many *praesciti* find themselves in the state of grace in their present righteousness; and that many *praedestinati* grievously sin in their present state of unrighteousness; but the *praesciti* never find themselves in the position of final perseverance, nor the *praedestinati* in that of final obduracy. On this ground, he rejects the *meritum de congruo* as an unscriptural fiction, something still worse than the doctrine of Pelagius.[2]

It is plain, that from Wicklif's doctrine follow unconditional necessity,[3] and the denial of free-will and of contingency. Still Wicklif would not throw back the causality of evil upon God.—Evil, as such, is whatever is not grounded in the divine ideas. It is known of God precisely as that which is not grounded in His ideas—*per carentiam ideae;* as darkness is known by light, and as the absence of light. Still nothing is thereby gained for

1 Ita concedendum videtur, quod temporale sit causa praedestinationis aeternae, praecedente tamen causa aeterna, tam ex parte dei taliter ordinantis, quam ex parte futurititionis creaturae taliter ordinatae. Dial. p. 74.

2 Ibid. p. 101.

3 Among the forty-five articles attributed to Wicklif, the proposition: Omnia de necessitate absoluta eveniunt might justly be condemned as one actually belonging to him.

moral contemplation. Evolving that which is contained in the thought, it would follow from it that evil, as evil, has for God no existence at all: but, looked at from the standing-point of the idea, all is necessary as belonging to the harmony of the world. Wicklif himself confesses the mischievous practical consequences to which his doctrine of unconditional necessity would lead. But his iron mind refuses to be frightened by such consequences. He says: "The wicked may, no doubt, find occasion from this doctrine to do many wicked things, and if it be in their power will actually do them. But it is unknown who those are; just as it is unknown to me but that some person will necessarily dash out my brains, and then grossly plead in excuse, that as the thing was necessary, he could not have helped it. But I will tell thee, for so irrational a deed he is necessarily guilty."[1] Accordingly, all sin appears to him a necessary thing; and so the punishment of sin. All is required in order to the beauty of the universe.[2] The whole multitude of the lost will serve to enhance the glory of the blessed.[3] God is none the less free, for doing anything in a way which is unconditionally necessary; as, for example, in the generation of the Son, and in the procession of the Holy Spirit. This agency, however, in the essence of God, is necessarily an eternal one; and the facts which result from it are in time. So far as this goes, they may be styled contingent.[4] It is an advantage of Wicklif's realistic bent, leading him to affirm that everything possible must at some time be actual, that it enables him to put aside the idle questions of the later Scholasticism about mere possibilities. "And thus we are freed"—says he—"from many superfluous speculations, with which the heretics (among whom he classes the nominalists) torture themselves in regard to certain supposable cases. It is more wholesome to study settled truths than idly to lose our-

1 Dial. p. 105.

2 Verumtamen illa concessa sequens est, quod omnia peccata mundi de necessitate evenient, et per consequens, quod omnes peccatores secundum formam, qua deus decreverat, punientur, et totum hoc facit ad pulchritudinem universi. Ibid. p. 148.

3 Totus numerus damnatorum cedet mundo ad profectum et gloriam beatorum. P. 154.

4 Ibid. p. 166: Et patet, quod deus non illibertatur quodcunque facere, licet absolute necessario illud agat, sicut non illibertatur producere verbum vel spiritum sanctum, licet absolute necessario illud agat. Actio tamen ista ad intra necessario est aeterna, et factio est temporalis. Ideo dicitur, quod factio est contingens.

selves in mere fictions, of which we cannot prove the possibility, nor that they or the knowledge of them can be of the least benefit to man; while many settled and profitable truths still lie hidden from man."[1]

The true protestant principle comes forth in Wicklif when he ascribes the whole work of salvation to Christ alone. He expresses it in opposition to the worship of saints. There is no saint in word or deed deserving of praise, except so far as he has derived all that for which he is praised from Christ.[2] "Hence our church"[3]—he says—"has this reasonable custom, that when a saint is invoked, she addresses the prayer to Christ; not principally to that saint, but to Christ." Nor is the festival of a saint to any purpose, except so far as it tends to magnify Christ, excites the soul to adore him, kindles in it the love of him. When, therefore, the observance of a saint-day deviates from this end, the motive must be avarice or some other sin. Hence many are disposed to think that all those festivals should be abolished, and the festival of Christ alone remain; for thus Christ would be kept in more lively remembrance, and the devotion of the faithful would not be so improperly distributed between Christ and his members. Foolish must he be who, instead of clinging to Christ alone, seeks the mediation of some other. "For Christ"—says he—"ever lives near the Father and is the most ready to intercede for us, imparting himself to the soul of every wayfaring pilgrim who loves him. Therefore should no man seek first the mediation of other saints, for he is more ready to help than any one of them." The soul must be distracted by the multitude of the blessed, to which it turns, the strength of the feelings for Christ must be weakened, as it is but a finite thing. It may likewise turn out, that the foolish devotee is worshipping a canonized devil. "When only Christ is invoked, the other saints, at his bidding, help with their spiritual intercessions; and, however much they may be worshipped apart, still they will assist none except in the measure they are commanded to do so by Christ. It seems a folly, to leave the fountain which is assuredly more ready to bestow itself on every one, and turn away to the distant and troubled brook; and especially where faith does not teach

[1] Dial. p. 164. [2] Ibid. p 171. [3] Ibid. p. 172.

that such a brook originates in the living fountain." At least then, those saints only should be worshipped, who are known to be such from the word of God. He is opposed to particular churches taking pains to procure the canonization of their saints from the Roman see, a practice which he traces to avarice or the want of faith. "Who"—says he—"would ever think of employing the interest of some court fool to obtain an interview with the more accessible and more gracious king himself? The saints in heaven are no court fools; but, incorporated by the grace of their Saviour with Christ, they are still infinitely less, in comparison with him, than the court fool is to his earthly prince." It were foolish, on a dangerous journey, to leave the straight and sure highway, and strike into some unsafe and unknown by-path; inasmuch, then, as the life of Christ and his rules are plainly open for our inspection, it would seem as if we must consider the contemplation of the life of others as of far less account. He calls the canonization of saints, expressing doubtless his own opinion, though he speaks of it as the view of many, a blasphemous thing; since without direct revelation no man can be certain about it. The miracles by which it was pretended to defend the canonization of saints, he puts down as delusions; for the devil, who can clothe himself as an angel of light, might perform still greater miracles in the person of a departed reprobate. The devil never sleeps; and he deceives the people whenever he can; hence many, thus led astray, honour a new-made saint more than the Lord Jesus Christ.

Adopting the common definition of a sacrament, *invisibilis gratiae forma et causa*, Wicklif remarks: "Every visible creature is also a sacrament, since it is a visible form of the invisible grace of the Creator, exhibits the image of his ideas, and may become to creatures a cause of invitation and of knowledge. Even a sermon would, in this sense, be a sacrament, since it is to the hearers a sign of holiness. He thinks that many signs might be cited from Scripture, which could be called sacraments with as much propriety as the seven.[1] "In the times of the old Covenant"—he says—"the church, like a virgin still in her youth, had to be educated by many sensible signs; but, with the growth of the church in the times of the law of grace, we are relieved from the

[1] Dial. p. 181.

necessity of giving so much heed to such signs." He finds a threefold abuse of signs in his own time: First, that signs of the Old Covenant were observed, which had been abolished. Secondly, a wanton coquetry with signs. There were many who showed such careful solicitude for these signs, which had no foundation in Scripture but were mere human inventions, that they would sooner transgress one of the ten commandments, than deviate from them in the least. Thirdly, overloading the Church, which Christ intended should be free, with such figures, even beyond what had been done in the church of the Old Testament. Avoiding this threefold abuse, the church should retain the moderate use of those signs in particular which had been instituted by Christ. Baptism, for example, was a sign instituted by Christ; and is necessary, because in this our state of pilgrimage, we are without clear knowledge, and need to be guided in the right way by such figures.[1] Confirmation he represents as a calumny against God, since it is affirmed by it, that bishops give the Holy Spirit in a new way, or confirm the giving of it. But this means, giving more than the Holy Spirit. The apostles (in Acts, ch. viii.) only prayed that those who believed might receive the Holy Ghost. He says:[2] "I boldly affirm, that in the early church, in the time of the apostle Paul, two orders of the clergy were sufficient, priests and deacons; in the time of Paul, bishop and presbyter were the same." Also in his Dialogue, he asserts that reason, as well as God's word, requires that while the wants of the clergy should be provided for, they should not be overburthened with temporal things, because these temporal things were of no use to the possessors, except as applied to the ends of their spiritual calling. The greater the poverty under which an evangelical man discharged his vocation, the more acceptable he was to Christ, other things being equal. It seemed probable to him that Silvester and others, in accepting the dotation, grievously sinned. But we may suppose that they afterwards did fruitful penance.[3] He maintains that princes were not only authorized but bound, on pain of damnation, to deprive the church of all her misappropriated secular goods: since they ought to repent of their own folly, and do satisfaction for the sinful act by which they had

1 Dial. p. 215. Ibid. p. 225. Ibid. p. 234.

defiled the church of Christ.[1] Was it objected that they had vowed such gifts to the church? he replies: a vow at variance with duty is not binding; as, for example, if a man has vowed to kill his brother, is he bound to perform that wicked deed? He declares heartfelt repentance and confession of sins before God to be the main thing on which all depends. Auricular confession he holds to be salutary, but not absolutely necessary.[2] He contends against the doctrine of the *thesaurus meritorum supererogationis*, which laid the foundation for indulgences. He styles it a gross blasphemy; and remarks upon it[3] that neither the pope nor Christ can deal otherwise with souls, or otherwise grant remission, than as God has eternally ordained in his righteous counsels.

But it is not proved that the pope, or any other one, has any just reason for so doing. Then he asks, in what member of the church does this merit reside? If it is in Christ and his members, then it would seem strange that the pope should have power to deprive the subjects of that which belongs to them; *first*, because the accident cannot exist separate from its subject; *secondly*, because they have verily received their full recompense in exact proportion to their desert. How then can the pope wrong God and them by any such pretended purloining? Finally, by the same principle, the pope has power, by the authority thus conceded to him, of saving all; and therefore it would be his fault if one individual, living in his own time, should go to perdition.

He affirms, that after the first thousand years, Satan was let loose for the next thousand, and that then the church declined remarkably from the imitation of Christ.[4] Hence arose the efforts of pious men to bring about a reformation, men who sought to restore the living imitation of Christ. Among these he reckons the efforts of Dominic and Francis, in whom, however, he deplores the lack of Christian wisdom; and he remarks that afterwards hypocrisy and impure motives soon crept in. If the order of Knights Templar was abolished on account of its degeneracy,

1 Dial. p. 237: Quod nedum possunt auferre temporalia ab ecclesia habitudinaliter delinquente, nec solum quod illis licet hoc facere, sed quod debent sub poena damnationis gehennae, cum debent de sua stultitia poenitere et satisfacere pro peccato, quo Christi ecclesiam macularunt.

2 Ibid. p. 251.

3 Ibid. p. 278.

4 Ibid. p. 280.

how much more ought these orders to be abolished?[1] He complains of the pharisaical spirit of his age:[2] "I turn"—says he—"to our Pharisees. The eyes of our private religion are too much dazzled by that pharisaical pride. For a bodily fast is prized more highly, or its non-observance, which can be noticed, is more regarded, than *spiritual* fasting. Therefore, from the folly of those orders, Lord, deliver us!"

In the writings of Wicklif, we meet with a remarkable prophecy of Luther's reformation, where he states that from monachism itself would go forth a reaction, founded in the very essence of Christianity, against the monastic life, and to the renovation of the church in the spirit of Paul. "I suppose"—says he—"that some brothers, whom God may vouchsafe to teach, will be devoutly converted to the primitive religion of Christ, and abandoning their false interpretations of genuine Christianity, after having demanded or acquired for themselves permission from antichrist, will freely return to the original religion of Christ; and then they will build up the church like Paul."[3] Thus he expresses the expectation, that a return to the true way of following Christ would proceed from the bosom of monachism itself, that its friends would obtain liberty from the popes to live in their own way, or would find means of conquering that liberty, and this would be the commencement of a renovated church, purified from the Jewish leaven, a church in the sense of the apostle Paul.

Wicklif was still entangled in the old scholastic views of the doctrine of justification. He gave especial prominence to the subjective side of this doctrine; and hence he agreed with Augustin and the schoolmen on this point, that no one could have certainty whether he belonged or not to the number of the elect. It is evident that in his case as in that of Augustin and the Thomists, this might be held in perfect consistency with his referring everything to grace alone, and placing freewill utterly in the back-ground. And hence, too, Wicklif may sometimes

1 Dial. p. 284. 2 P. 144.

3 P. 271: *Suppono autem, quod aliqui fratres quos deus docere dignatur, ad religionem primaevam Christi devotius convertentur, et relicta sua perfidia sive obtenta sive petita Antichristi licentia redibunt libere ad religionem Christi primaevam, et tunc aedificabunt ecclesiam sicut Paulus.*

give prominence to the trust of a Christian in the consciousness of his own pious life, though he regarded everything in that life as being but a work of divine grace. Accordingly he says: When God rewards a good work, he crowns his own gift. Hence, too, we may with Vaughan[1] compare Wicklif with Luther, in his views of the doctrine of justification. But trust in the redemption by Christ is, in truth, made the central point also by the scholastic theologians of the 13th century. Yet, in making this subjective conception of justification his point of departure, and deriving everything from the divine fellowship of life with Christ, he came to a more profound and spiritual conception of the church, as an inward unity to be traced to the same common inward fact, in contradistinction from the outward unity contended for on the position held by the church. "Holy Church"—he says—"is the congregation of just men for whom Christ shed his blood; and not mere stones, and timber, and earthly dross, which the priests of antichrist magnify more than the righteousness of God and the souls of men."[2] So he declaims against those who, when men speak of holy church, understand thereby prelates and priests, with monks, canons, and friars, and all men who have tonsures, though they live accursedly, and never so contrary to the law of God. And he contends against the distinction which, from this point of view, was made between spirituals and seculars.[3] "Those people"—he says—"would not reckon as belonging to the church the *secular* men of holy church, though they live never so truly according to God's law, and die in perfect charity. Nevertheless, all who shall be saved in the bliss of heaven are members of holy church and no more." So from this position he combats the hypothesis of the necessity of a *visible* head of the church. "Prelates"—he observes—"make many new points of belief, and say it is not enough to believe in Jesus Christ, and to be baptized—as Christ says in the gospel by St Mark—except a man also believe that the bishop of Rome is the head of holy church. But certainly no apostle of Jesus Christ ever constrained any man to believe this of himself. And yet they were certain of their salvation in heaven. How then

1 Vaughan, tom. ii. 359.

2 Ibid. ii. 279.

3 In his work not yet published: of Prelates. Vaughan, tom. ii. p. 279.

should any sinful wretch constrain men to believe that he is head of holy church, while he knows not whether he shall be saved or lost?" A bishop of Rome might possibly be one of those who are to be condemned for their sins; and in this case men would be compelled to regard a devil of hell as the head of holy church. He makes the *true* conception of a vicar of Christ to rest on the personal imitation of Christ. In one who exhibits the contrary character, he sees not the vicar of Christ, but rather antichrist; as he says:[1] The pope is the chief antichrist, for he himself falsely pretends that he is the most immediate vicar of Christ and most resembling him in life; and, consequently, the most humble pilgrim, the poorest man, and the farthest removed from worldly men and worldly things: when, however, the fact generally is, that he stands first in the opposite sins. He says in one of his last sermons:[2] "So long as Christ is in heaven, the church hath in him the best pope, and that distance hindereth him not in doing his deeds, as he promiseth that he is with his always to the end of the world. We dare not put two heads, lest the church be monstrous." The Head above is therefore commended as alone worthy of confidence. As he divided the church into three parts: preachers, defenders, and labourers, so he describes the clergy in particular as persons whose office is to teach; for it is characteristic of him to seize the clerical office on this *particular side* of it, as the preaching office. Preachers should set an example to all of walking after Christ; they should be nearest to Christ, and nearest heaven, and fullest of charity.[3] But the manifold gradations of rank among the clergy he held to be utterly foreign to Christianity. Difficult as it then must have been, he could look at the apostolic age with sufficient freedom from prejudice to see that these distinctions were of later origin, that at the beginning there was but *one* order of presbyters. There should be but one spiritual order, he supposed. Originally there were only priests and deacons; but the fiend, he remarks, has changed this part to many colours, as seculars and religious. And these have both many parts, as popes and cardinals, and bishops, and archdeacons, etc. Hence have arisen sectarian animosities and the spirit of domination; all this had come of men's forsaking the

1 Dial. p. 130. Vaughan, tom. ii. p. 273 note.
2 Ibid. p. 308.

rule of the New Testament, according to which it were better that there should be but one order.[1]

II. The Movements of Reform in Bohemia.

1. *Forerunners of John Huss.*

The great reformatory movement in Bohemia dates back to Militz, the individual who gave the first impulse to it. We see his influence continuing still to operate through his disciples, Matthias of Janow and John Huss. Militz came from Cremsia in Moravia. He was appointed archdeacon to the cathedral church in Prague, enjoyed a handsome income, and stood high in the esteem of the king of Bohemia, and of the Emperor Charles IV., whose secretary and chancellor he was, and whom he attended when he went abroad, as for example, in his journey to Germany.[2] Even then he was distinguished for his untiring, pious zeal for the salvation of souls, for his self-sacrificing, disinterested charity. He devoted himself with an earnest spirit to the duty of church visitations, and when employed on this service declined the support he was entitled to from the parish priests, defraying his own expenses without living at the cost of any one.[3] His piety had a tinge of ascetic austerity; a thing not uncommon in the most different periods, with persons of a serious, devout spirit, who, from grieving over the corruption of their times, and from disgust at the worldliness of a clergy sunk in luxury and ease, naturally fell into this peculiar bent. With his pastoral visitations he was in the habit of uniting exercises of penance, wearing a rough hair-shirt, or sometimes two, next to his skin.[4] But the ardent zeal of this good man could not be satisfied with these labours. He felt himself impelled to take a

1 Vaughan.

2 Vid. Franz Palacky Geschichte von Böhmen, 3 Bd. 1 Abthiel. Prag. 1845, p. 164.

3 See the Life of Militz, by one of his disciples, which the Jesuit Balbirus has published in the Miscellaneis hist. regni Bohemiae, Pragae, 1682, decadis i., lib. iv., pars. ii., tit. 34, p. 44.

4 The words of his disciples in the biographical sketch mentioned in the preceding note, p. 45: Statim coepit in cilicio peragere poenitentiam, et quando iter alicujus partis arripiebat, tunc duo cilicia caute et secrete cognato suo clerico, nomine Stephano, quasi pro majori suo thesauro studiose recommendabat custodienda.

more earnest interest, as a preacher and pastor, in the poor, forsaken people, whose necessities seemed to require it. This was a duty which he supposed he had yet to learn; his life appeared to him to be still too worldly. He felt himself moved to renounce splendour, honour, comfort; to strive after a closer imitation, even to the letter, of the life of Christ and the apostles. This idea, of whose influence in these times we have often had occasion to speak, the idea of following Christ in preaching the gospel in poverty and humility, had taken possession also of the heart of this devout man. He, therefore, resolved to resign his present post, and give up his whole income. In vain did the members of the cathedral chapter try to dissuade him from carrying this resolution into effect. In vain did Ernest, the archbishop of Prague, who felt unwilling to part with such a fellow-labourer, say to him, "What better thing can you possibly do, than to stand by your poor bishop in his watch over the flock?" He retired, in the autumn of 1363, to the little town of Bischofteinitz, in the Pilsen circuit, where he spent half a year in the capacity of an assistant to the parish priest, zealously labouring as a preacher and curate. The priest owned a fine garden, stocked with fruit-trees. Militz felt himself strongly attracted to this spot. But the stern man, stern and severe to himself, looked even upon this as a temptation of Satan. Thou art come here, said he to himself, not to enjoy thy ease, but to work, to look after poor souls; and he denied himself the relaxation of the garden and the enjoyment of its fruit.

Having disciplined himself in this way for half a year, he returned to Prague; and without accepting any particular office to which a salary was affixed, he began to preach to the people in the language of the country, first at St Nicholas in the Klein quarter, then at St Aegidius in the old town. His novel and simple way of preaching met at first with but little favour.[1] He was derided on account of his pronunciation, and his want of readiness in repeating certain liturgical forms, and in announcing festivals.[2] He had but a small number of hearers. His friends advised him to give up preaching, as he could accomplish nothing

1 In the biography above cited, p. 45, it is said: Propter incongruentiam vulgaris sermonis.

2 Propter oblivionem in festis incidentis. Ibid.

in that way. How many devout and learned men had failed as preachers? Why should he expend his energies to no purpose? But Militz replied: "If I can save but a single soul, it will satisfy me. The example of my Saviour teaches me this, who did not disdain to accept the one Canaanite woman." As nothing could divert him from his purpose, so his fervent zeal was soon crowned with the happiest results. His sermons produced more effect every day. Many men and women were awakened to repentance under them, confessed their sins to him, and commenced a new Christian life. Usurers and others pursuing unlawful gains, renounced their old wicked courses. Many, filled with disgust at the life of the world, withdrew from it into a rigid ascetic tendency. These results of his labours stimulated him to still greater activity. He preached twice every Sunday and holiday, and occasionally three, four, and even five times daily, in different churches; and his sermons, which were listened to with constantly increasing attention, lasted several hours. He had but little time, therefore, to prepare for them. He endeavoured to gain strength for this duty in prayer. Other *learned* clergymen had to complain, that with their utmost exertion, they could not accomplish what Militz was enabled to do after an hour's preparation. On finishing the labours of the day, when he returned home weary and exhausted with so much preaching, he was surrounded and followed by multitudes, seeking spiritual consolation and advice, which he imparted to all with kindness and affection. At an advanced period of his life he learned German, for the purpose of extending his labours also to the German population, and he now preached in this language as well as his own. To the students of the University of Prague, and to the learned, he preached in the Latin language, and was listened to by eager crowds. He had to lend his sermons for the students to copy; and thus they became multiplied. Matthias of Janow, his enthusiastic disciple, of whom we shall speak more particularly hereafter, says of him: "Having been a simple priest and secretary at the prince's court, before his experience of this visitation by the spirit of Christ, he grew so rich in wisdom and all utterance of doctrine, that it was a light matter to him to preach five times in a day; namely, once in Latin, once in German, and then again in the Bohemian tongue,

and this publicly, with mighty fervour and a powerful voice, and he constantly brought forth from his treasures things new and old."[1] Great was the effect produced by the preaching of Militz, on the female sex in particular; many were induced by his sermons to lay aside their ornaments of pride.[2] Through all Bohemia were to be found young maidens who owed to him their conversion, and presented patterns of true piety in their womanly virtues.[3] Prague was then a seat of extreme depravation of manners. There was one quarter of the city devoted wholly to pleasure; full of brothels,—"Little Venice," as it was called, and, in Bohemian, *Benatky*. Militz proposed to transform this seat of sin into a seat of the Christian virtues. He commenced with little beginnings, and ended with great results. He succeeded at first in converting twenty licentious women. He got them to dwell in one house. He found devout women in good circumstances, who were willing to look after them. He took unwearied pains himself in promoting their moral improvement. Some of them were married to husbands, others taken into the service of pious ladies. At length he succeeded in extending his labours to several hundreds. The houses of licentiousness were emptied. The place which they had occupied was partly given up by the emperor and the magistrates of the city to Militz, for the promotion of his pious object, and other houses were purchased with money supplied by charitable contributions. He founded here a Magdalene hospital, with a chapel, in which there was preaching every day for the benefit of the new converts. "Little Venice," now converted into a seat of piety,

1 From a manuscript work of Matth. of Janow, "De regulis veteris et novi testamenti:" Nam cum fuit ante simplex presbyter et scriptor in curiis principum, antequam fuit siccine a spiritu Jesu visitatus, in tantum sapientia et omni verbo doctrinae dives est effectus, quod facile erat eidem quinquies in uno die praedicare, puta semel in latino sermone, semel in teutonico, et iterum boëmico, et hoc publice et in communi cum clamore et zelo valido, atque in singulis nova et vetera de suo thesauro proferendo et in magno ordine, pondere et mensura, ita ut potest hinc elici, quod tota dies cedebat sibi ad praedicandum, clamandum et laborandum; communiter autem bis et ter in die festivo praedicabat; quotidie vero sine interruptione unum sermonem faciebat.

2 Crescente itaque praedicatione ejus, incoeperunt mulieres superbae pepla alta, et gemmis circumdata caputia, et vestimenta auro et argento ornata deponere. Balbinus, l. l. p. 46.

3 Matth. of Janow, in the work cited in the preceding note, says: Adolescularum autem virginum et viduarum non erat numerus, quia miro modo igne caritatis Jesu a verbo ipsius inflammatae usque hodie per universam Boëmiam perseverant.

obtained the name of "Little Jerusalem." We see, in Militz, one of the leaders and founders of domestic missions;—an institution much needed in such an age. Matthias of Janow thus describes these labours of Militz, by which Prague underwent so complete a change: "O, how many vices, conquered by him, had to give up the field! And if Militz had not come, and so much had not been accomplished by his voice thundering to the skies, we should, of a truth, have been as Sodom, and perished like Gomorrah. But now, by the grace of Christ, through the energy and pains of Militz, Sodom has been restored to her ancient worth; from being a Babylon, Prague is spiritually transformed, full of the word of Christ, and of the doctrine of salvation; for now that the abominable, the open and public vices have been conquered, the Christian virtues find room to bud and blossom in many souls, and increase daily both in number and vigour."[1] The same Matthias of Janow remarks of this extraordinary man: "I confess that I cannot enumerate even the tenth part of what my own eyes saw, my own ears heard, and my hands handled, though I lived with him but a short time."

But Militz was not so well satisfied with himself. After he had thus laboured for a period of from five to six years in Prague, and also in several other cities within the circle of Olmutz, the sense of his own unworthiness was too much for him; he was desirous of withdrawing from the office of preacher, and of consecrating himself to a still more rigid life as a monk. But the advice of his friends, and their representations of the bad effects which must necessarily result from the sudden interruption of such active and successful labours, held him back. Militz expresses his own feelings thus: "I was in the spirit and meditated on what is written in the Revelation—To him that overcometh will I give of the tree of life; and I knew that if I overcame the

1 The words of Matth. of Janow: O quam multa vitia et abundantia omnis iniquitatis abierunt retro debellata, perindeque nisi Myliczius venisset, et procul dubio suo clamore ad coelum usque effecisset, quod prorsus quasi Sodoma et quasi Gomorra periissemus. Ast nunc Christo Jesu propitio, virtute et labore Myliczii Sodoma rediit in antiquam dignitatem, et de Babylone spiritualiter facta est Praga jam adundans omni verbo Christi et doctrina salutari, nam vitiis horrendis praesertim publicis, jam depugnatis et post tergum projectis, virtutes Christi Jesu in animabus jam pulsant caputque erigentes continue atque quotidie invalescunt secundum numerum et gradus, Jesu crucifixo ipsis praestante gloriosa incrementa.

sin that is in me, I should taste of the tree of life, or of the understanding of the Holy Spirit, and I prayed often, that Almighty God would give me the Holy Spirit, and anoint me with his unction, that I might not fall into any error, and might enjoy the taste and perfume of true wisdom, so that I might deceive none and be deceived by none, and wish no longer to know anything but what is necessary for me and the holy church. And soon a voice thundered in my heart, telling me how I once longed to taste of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and to know more than I could know; and although, collecting my thoughts within me, I had often done penance for this, I had still not fully understood how blind I was, how much I needed to crucify the flesh, to deny myself in my own heart, and to take upon me the cross of Christ. I understand this now. Therefore the Spirit, speaking to me in my heart, told me that I should begin to take up the cross, crucify my flesh, forsake and deny myself, and enter upon the monastic life; that I should think meanly of myself, and not preach; for I was not yet fit for it. And I was held back from doing so by all my advisers, who remonstrated against it; but still I have, for a long time, abstained from preaching."

From this confession we see that Militz, in contemplating the corruption of the church, was filled with the sense of his own unworthiness, so as to be on the point of retiring wholly from the world; as he actually did abstain, for a while, from preaching. But he must soon have felt himself impelled again, by that spirit of Elias which possessed him, instead of retiring into solitude, to stand forth and manfully contend with the corruptions of his age. During this period of his temporary seclusion from the world, Militz glanced from the present—as the corruption of the church prompted many persons of a reformatory and presageful spirit, in these times, to do—to the dawning morn of a better future. In those signs of the time, set forth in the New Testament as harbingers of Christ's advent, have often been depicted to the eyes of inspired seers the signs of some approaching new epoch for the kingdom of Christ. They could cast presaging glances into the future, though they failed of the exact truth in particulars, and they erred in this respect, that, overlooking the manifold intermediate epochs which are to prepare

the way for the great and final crisis, they looked upon this last itself as the one immediately impending. Thus Militz sought to interpret the signs of the present by comparing them with the prophecies of the Old Testament, the last discourses of Christ, and the prophetical intimations in the epistles of St Paul. He saw the way preparing for a divine judgment on the corrupt church; he foresaw a renovation of the church, by which it was to be prepared for the second advent of Christ. The prophetic images which presented themselves in his visions, appeared to him as revelations of the Divine Spirit. From him as the source proceeded those prophetic ideas, which further developed afterwards by his disciple Matthias of Janow, extended their influence also to John Huss. Important in this regard is particularly his tract *De Antichristo*, which has been preserved by Matthias of Janow in his own larger work above cited. Under the "abomination of desolation" (Matt. xxv.), he finds signified corruption in all parts of the church. The apostacy of the Jewish nation from divine truth appears to him an ante type of the fall of the secularized church from evangelical truth. Antichrist, he supposes, is not still to come, but has come already. He says in his tract on the Antichrist: Where Christ speaks of the "abomination" in the temple, he invites us to look round and observe how, through the negligence of her pastors, the church lies desolate; just as, by the negligence of its pastors, the synagogue lay desolate. Hence if at present the church has abundance of peace and superfluity of earthly riches, still it has been deprived of spiritual riches, and so is fulfilled that word of prophecy, Iniquity has taken the upper hand. Has not love grown cold; has not iniquity taken the upper hand? Therefore have they many prebends which they have obtained by simony, or through avarice; while many others are driven thereby to beg or steal; the poor members of Christ are deprived of what belongs to them. Hence the sale and purchase of sacraments, of burial-places; hence much simony in the monastic orders; hence private possessions in the hands of those who have renounced riches. Are not these abominations and idols? And thus the temple of God lies desolate, through the hypocrisy that reigns almost universally; so that the priests are one thing, but would be called another. The monks hear confessions indiscriminately, without obtaining leave from the dio-

cesan authorities. He next surveys the corruption in all ranks of society, in kings, princes, noblemen, merchants, artisans, peasantry; notices how debauchery, luxury, perversion of justice, oppression of the poor, every description of vice, abounded; how more faith was given to the conjuror's art than to the gospel. "When I considered all this"—he says—"I said to the Spirit, which spake within me, Who is antichrist? And he answered, There are many antichrists. He who denies Christ, and the authority of Christ, is an antichrist. And as many who say they know him, deny him by their works, while others deny him by keeping still and not daring to confess him and the truth of his cause before men; conclude from this who is antichrist." The appearance of antichrist being, in the opinion of Militz, not a thing still in the future, but already present, it was his opinion also that the angels, whom Christ was to send forth before the last judgment, to gather up the tares and to sound the trumpet of judgment, symbolized the preachers of divine truth, who were to be sent out, before the second advent of Christ, into all quarters, to attack and destroy the reign of antichrist and to testify of Christ. When Militz strove to suppress these thoughts concerning the last times, as temptations, he found they were too mighty for him. He was forced to give up to them. He felt himself called to inform Pope Urban V. of the visions which rose in his mind, and to use them in warning and admonishing that pope. He must go—for such he supposed was the voice of the Spirit—and tell the pope that he had been called, by the Holy Ghost, to the duty of bringing back the church to the way of salvation, the duty of sending forth the angels or preachers, with the trumpets of the message and loud voices, that they might remove those scandals from the field of God or from the church; and as the harvest, or the end of the world drew near, that he should now root up the tares, the heretics, false prophets, hypocrites, Beghards and Beguins,[1] and schismatics, who were all designated by the names Gog and Magog; that then the fulness of the Gentiles would enter into the kingdom of God, and the

1 It will be remembered that this name, since the times of the 13th century, was variously used, sometimes in a good and sometimes in a bad sense, to denote truly devout, also fanatical and hypocritical tendencies, and even such as proceeded from a wildly enthusiastic pantheism.

true Israel alone be left standing; and thus all would be one shepherd and one fold, and bound together by such cords of love —if not all, yet many—that all things would be held in common, as the Holy Ghost should direct. Accordingly he must advise the pope to call a general council, at which all the bishops might unite in some plan for the reformation of the communities entrusted to their charge, and for the restoration of good discipline. Monks and secular priests should be exhorted to go forth as preachers; for many of them wasted away their lives in idleness, when they might be active in labours, and strong in dispensing the word. The pope was to make arrangements for a general crusade, *i.e.* a peaceful crusade of men preaching the Lord and fighting for him, prepared to die—to suffer for Christ—rather than to kill.[1] These should overcome the beast (of the Apocalypse) or antichrist, by the blood of the Lamb, and build a safe highway to the land of eternal promise. Not a crusade, therefore, for the opening a way to the Jerusalem on earth, but a spiritual crusade, which, by the triumphant diffusion of the word of Christ, should make the heavenly Jerusalem accessible to all, was what Militz had in mind. He beholds, in spirit, how many martyrs would die for the truth, and by the blood of these martyrs the sins of the Christian people should be expiated. "Were these to be silent"—says he—"the very stones would cry out."

Militz, in the year 1367, felt himself called to go to Rome; and took with him, as companions, Theodoric a monk, and one of his disciples of the ecclesiastical order. He went to Rome either because he hoped to find Pope Urban V. already there, (the report that Urban intended to transfer the seat of the papacy back to that city having perhaps already reached Prague), or because he thought it his duty to testify, first of all, in the ancient seat of the papacy and the chief city of Christendom, concerning the revelation of antichrist and the preparation for Christ's second coming. He had resided in Rome a month, pre-

[1] Hinc faciat passagium generale, aliis dominum praedicantibus et pugnantibus plus mori quam occidere, pati pro Christo. Militz's language is somewhat obscure, as it is in the whole of this writing. It may be understood to mean, that the sending forth of preachers was to be distinguished from a proper crusade. But it hardly corresponds with the spirit of Militz to suppose he meant that infidels were to be attacked by force of arms. The import of the whole seems rather to be that the crusade was not to be one in the literal sense, but the opposite--a spiritual crusade.

paring himself, by study of the Scriptures, prayer, and fasting, for the work to which he felt himself called. The pope, however, did not make his appearance; his return to Rome was still delayed, and Militz could no longer keep silent. He caused a notification to be posted up at the entrance of St Peter's church, that on a certain day he would there make his public appearance and address the assembled multitude; that he would announce the coming of antichrist, and exhort the people to pray for the pope and the emperor, that they might be enabled so to order the affairs of the church, in things spiritual and temporal, that the faithful might securely serve their Creator.[1] He proposed, moreover, to reduce his sermon to writing, that his language might not be misconstrued and represented as heretical, and that what he spoke might be more widely published abroad.[2] But a notice of this sort could not fail to excite suspicion, and Militz had already, by his castigatory sermons, drawn down upon himself the hatred of the mendicant monks in Prague; he was therefore waylaid and apprehended, and the inquisitor, who belonged to the Dominican order, placed him under arrest. He was to be called before the tribunal. His companion Theodoric was shut up in a Dominican convent. Militz, loaded with chains, was delivered over to the Franciscans, to be kept in close confinement. He showed the greatest patience and gentleness under his sufferings; not a word of revenge escaped his lips; his meek forbearance confounded his persecutors. His companion Theodoric found it more difficult to suppress his indignation at such unjust treatment; but Militz admonished him to think on the sufferings of Christ, who was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and opened not his mouth. A devout woman in Rome charitably undertook to provide for

1 Militz himself reports this in his paper on the Antichrist: Et tunc jam desperassem de adventu domini nostri papae, . . . et tunc irruit in me spiritus, ita ut me continere non possem, dicens in corde, vade in Roma, publice pertracta, qua quomodo affligetur hostis ecclesiae S. Petri, sic sollicitus fuisti intimare in Praga, quoniam eris praedicaturus, quod velis praedicare, quod antichristus venit, et cohortari eos velles et populum, ut orent pro domino nostro papa et pro domino imperatore, ut ita ordinent ecclesiam sanctam in spiritualibus et temporalibus, ut securi fideles deserviant creatori. It is evident that the author of the biographical sketch of Militz, published by Balbin, had this paper before him, and that his account is founded on it.

2 Militz expresses himself as follows: Et dabis in scriptis sermonem illum, ne immutent verba tua, et ut materia divulgetur.

their wants; but Militz was greatly pained when he came to be informed that she sent better food to him than to his companion Theodoric. After having been long detained in close confinement, he was asked, what it had been his intention to preach. He requested his examiners to give him the Bible, which had been taken from him at the time of his arrest, with paper, pen, and ink, and he would put his discourse in writing. This was granted, and his fetters were removed. Before a large assembly of prelates and learned men, in the church of St Peter, he delivered a discourse in Latin, which produced a great impression. He was then conducted back to his prison, but treated with less severity. It was in his cell that he afterwards composed his above-mentioned work "On the Antichrist," as appears from his own words: "The author writes this, a prisoner and in chains, troubled in spirit, longing for the freedom of Christ's church, longing that Christ would speak the word, Let it be, and it shall be; and protesting that he has not kept back that which was in his heart, but has spoken it out to the church, and that he is prepared to hold fast to whatever the pope or the church may lay on him." But no sooner had Pope Urban arrived at Rome, than the situation of Militz was altered for the better. He was set free from prison and received into the palace of a cardinal; he had a favourable audience with the pope, and returned back to Prague to the great joy of his community. The exultation at his return was the greater, because his enemies, the mendicants, had foretold to the people from the pulpit, that he would perish at the stake.

He recommenced with new zeal his labours in Prague. He was not satisfied with the little good that could be effected by his own personal labours in preaching. He was often heard to say: "Would that all were prophets." He set up a school for preachers. And when he had trained up an able young priest, he took pains himself to draw upon him the attention of the communities, pointing him out as one who would surpass his master, as one whom they should listen to with care. He founded an association composed of two or three hundred young men, all of whom resided under the same roof with himself, were trained under his influence, and by his society. He copied the books which they were to study, and gave them devotional books to

copy themselves, for the sake of multiplying them. All here was to be free; to flow spontaneously from the one animating spirit by which all were to be governed. An internal tie was all that held them together; no outward discipline or rule, no vow, no uniformity of dress. The disciples of Militz soon distinguished themselves by their serious, spiritual lives, and by their style of preaching. Hence they too, like himself, were made butts of ridicule and persecution by the worldly-minded clergy, whom the lives of these exemplary young men stung with shame and reproach. They were nick-named Militzans, Beghards. The beneficence of Militz was without bounds. Crowds of the poor were always to be seen collected before his doors. He gave all he had to help them; reserving nothing at all for himself; so that when everything else was gone, he sold his books, the very books which he used himself, and which he kept ready to lend to any that needed.[1] When he had nothing more he ran round among other clergymen and the rich, and collected contributions,[2] never allowing himself to lose heart by any rude rebuff he might chance to receive from those whose charities he asked. Nothing was left him but the most indispensable articles of clothing; not even what was needful to protect him, in midwinter, from the inclemency of the season. A rich man had said: Militz suffered so much from the cold, he would be glad to present him with a set of furs if he could only be sure that he would keep it. On hearing of it, Militz observed: He was far from wishing to keep anything for himself alone; on that condition he could not accept of the furs. He was often persecuted and stigmatized as a heretic; but his patience and gentleness never failed him for a moment; and he used to say: "Let me suffer ever so much persecution, when I bethink me of the fervent penitence of that poor woman—referring to one who had been converted by his means from a life of licentiousness and crime—the bitterest cup becomes sweet to me, for all *I* suffer is as nothing compared to the grief of that one woman."

The enemies of Militz at length extracted from his sermons

1 Propter quod dum omnibus libris, quos solos pro docendo habuerat, et paucos obligavit, vendidit et expendit, are the words of Matth. of Janow.

2 Matth. of Janow remarks, after the words just cited: Tunc mutuando a divitibus et rogando non sine magnis contumeliis et repulsa discurrendo.

twelve articles, which they sent to a certain Master Klonkot, an agent of theirs, probably himself a Bohemian, who happened to be present at the papal court in Avignon. It is very manifest how wide an influence Militz must have already gained by means of his school. The pope saw clearly that such doctrines would be disseminated through Bohemia, Poland, and Silesia. He put forth several bulls to the archbishop of Gnesen, the bishop of Breslau, the archbishop of Prague, and to the Emperor Charles IV. He expressed his surprise to the bishops that they should have tolerated until now the spread of such heretical, schismatic doctrines through so wide a circle; called upon them to suppress the same, and bring Militz and his adherents to punishment. Yet even Gregory XI. must assuredly have been still somewhat uncertain himself whether wrong had not been done to Militz; for he uses the qualifying expressions,—"if it is so"—"if you find that it is so."[1] In the bull addressed to the Emperor Charles, he says: "We have recently learned from the report of several credible persons, that a certain priest Militz, formerly a canonical at Prague, under the garb of sanctity, but in the spirit of temerity and self-conceit, has taken upon himself the calling to preach which does not belong to him, and has dared to teach openly in your dominions many errors, which are not only bad and rash, but also heretical and schismatic, extremely mischievous and dangerous to the faithful, especially the simple." When the pope's bull arrived at Prague, the archbishop was confounded. He caused Militz to be cited, and complained to him of his perplexity. Militz, however, remained perfectly tranquil in the consciousness of his innocence, and bid the archbishop take courage, as his conscience was clear. He placed his trust in God and the power of the truth; these would triumph over every assault. He went to Avignon in the year 1374; but died there while his cause was still pending.[2]

1 Annales Raynaldi, tom vii., 1374, ad ann. Nr. 10 and 11, p. 251.

2 We follow here the report of Matth. of Janow, as the one most worthy of credence, who says of Militz: Avenione exulans est mortuus. It must be an error when it is said, in the biography published by Balbinus, that he went to Rome. This error might easily arise from the confounding together of the curia Romana and the curia Avenionensis. It must also be a mistake that, as the report in Balbin has it, Militz returned back to Prague and died there. We might suggest the inquiry, whether in the biography preserved in Balbin, a report got up in the lifetime of Militz, and another composed after his death, may not be blended together.

In connection with Militz we should notice Conrad of Waldhausen,[1] a German from Austria, who was distinguished in Bohemia as a preacher full of zeal for reform.[2] He belonged to the order of St Augustin, and exerted a great influence, at first as a priest, by his sermons, in Vienna, from the year 1345 and onward, through a period of fifteen years.[3] Within this period fell the jubilee already mentioned as having been proclaimed by Pope Clement VI. While an opportunity of this sort would be seized upon by the common preachers of indulgence to do still greater mischief to the souls of men, Conrad of Waldhausen would feel himself called upon the more to wake up the attention of the misguided people as a preacher of repentance. Without contending against the determinations of that church doctrine, to which he himself was devoted, he might still endeavour to counteract the pernicious influence of the ordinary preachers of indulgences, and to direct men's attention to the internal moral conditions which were required in order to derive any true benefit from indulgences. It seems that he was led by this occasion of the jubilee to make the pilgrimage himself to Rome, and that, on this journey and after his return from it, he laboured as a

1 This Conrad of Waldhausen first became better known through the researches of Palacky, to whom I am indebted for the first oral communications respecting him (see his History of Bohemia, 3, 1, 161 ff. and note 226), and through those of P. Jordan in his paper, "Die Vorläufer des Hussitenthums in Böhmen," which learned man may also have availed himself of Palacky's researches. An erroneously printed passage in Cochlaeus (historiae Hussitarum libri xii., p. 42), taken from the writing of a contemporary of Huss, the Bohemian theologian Andrew of Broda, who wrote against Huss, caused this forerunner of Huss to be forgotten and to be confounded with another castigator of the corrupt clergy, the Cistercian John of Stekna, when the friends of Huss, for example, said in his justification, that he was persecuted merely on account of his castigatory discourses against the corrupt clergy, this Andrew of Broda replied, by appealing to the examples of those three castigatory preachers before him, Militz, the above mentioned Conrad, and John of Stekna, who, however, had not been accused of heresy; and he says in this connection: Nam et ab antiquis temporibus Milicius, Conradus, Sczekna et alii caet. The simple fact, that the two last names were not separated from each other by a comma, led to the entire mistake.

2 Matth. of Janow characterizes both Militz and Conrad of Waldhausen as men full of the spirit of Elijah. He says: Conradus Walthauser, homo utique religiosus et devotus, qui dictis suis et scriptis principales metropoles sanctae ecclesiae repleverunt utpote Romam et Avenionem, ubi Papa, et Bohemiam atque Pragam, ubi ecclesiae imperatoris. Unus ipsorum Conradus in Praga occubuit, ubi Caesar, caet.

3 We take this from a remark made by the man himself in his piece in defence of himself, composed in 1364, and still unpublished: Jam per quindecim annos laboriosae coram ducibus Austriae coramque populo multo palam concione caet.

preacher of repentance in Austria and Bohemia till he arrived at Prague. We take this from his own writings. For when, at some later period, his violent enemies of the two orders of mendicant friars accused him of disturbing everywhere by his sermons the public peace,—a charge often brought against preachers who by their searching discourses produced some movement which was opposed to the selfish interests of many, —he in defending himself compares this accusation with the one brought against Christ, namely, that he stirred up the people; that he taught from city to city, in the whole land of Judea, beginning from Galilee even unto Jerusalem; where he remarks,—and so they say of me: He has set the people in commotion, beginning—and, herein, at least, they speak the truth—beginning from Rome, the seat of the apostolical chair, in the year of the jubilee, and teaching through all Austria, even to this city of Prague, from this time, by God's wonderful dealing, become an imperial city.[1] This happened, therefore, in the year 1350. By these labours he must have become known to the king of Bohemia, the Emperor Charles IV., who sought in every way to advance the interests of the Bohemian people. The emperor endeavoured to secure him for this country, and, in the year 1360, he was called, as parish priest, to the city of Leitmeritz. Partly his earnest wish to labour on a wider scale for the salvation of souls and against the corruption of these times, an opportunity for which was offered to him in Prague, and partly a controversy in which he became involved with a convent of Dominicans and Franciscans, who sought to circumscribe the activity of the parish priest and to take everything into their own hands, induced him to make his appearance as a preacher in Prague.[2] He preached, first, for a year, in the

1 Commovit populum docens per universam Austriam, incipiens, ut verum saltem in hoc dicant, a Romana civitate sedis apostolicae, anno Jubilaeo docens per universam Austriam usque hanc scil. in Pragam, ex tunc mirabiliter dei dispensatu civitatem imperialem.

2 Conrad's opponents allege, as the reason why he left his parish, what he himself stated: (Scripserunt, me dixisse in quodam sermone, causam, quare in parochia mea non residerem, esse) quia ipsam duo monasteria fratrum mendicantium attenuassent ibidem, et esset ratio, quia abstulissent sibi populum suum, et sibi attraxissent. And he grants that this was one reason, but not the only one, nor the chief one. Respondeo, quod ista omnia sunt vera, praeter hoc, quod dixerunt, esse hoc praecipuam causam sed tantum fuit concausa.

church of St Galli, in Prague.[1] But the crowd of people who were impressed by his preaching constantly increased; and, as he thought it wrong to withhold God's word from any one who was drawn to hear it, but felt bound to labour for the salvation of as many as he could, he preached, the church being no longer large enough for his audience, in the open market place to the vast crowds who there assembled around him .He also, like Militz, supposed that he saw in the anti-christian spirit of his times, the signs of the last preparatory epoch which was to precede the second advent of Christ; and his sermons were frequently taken up in directing the attention of his hearers to these signs, in warning them against the impending dangers, exhorting them to watchfulness over themselves and against the insidious spread of anti-christian corruption. "Not willing"—says he—"that the blood of souls should be required at my hands, I traced, as I was able, in the Holy Scripture, the future dangers impending over the souls of men."[2] Accordingly he attacked, in his sermons, the prevailing vices in all ranks of society, the pride of dress in the women; usury; lightness and vanity in the youth. Many, under the influence of his preaching, experienced an entire change of heart. He produced such an effect on many usurers that they restored back their wrongful gains; this he required them to do, as evidence of their conversion. A certain young man, by the name of Slanko, was looked upon as one of the most remarkable examples of his singular power in reaching the souls of men. This person took the lead among the giddy, light-minded youth, given up to every vanity. Without any purpose of devotion he visited the churches, where he amused himself with looking round upon the young ladies, nodding to them, and throwing pebbles at them, even during the fasts; and so he went on during all the first part of the time that Conrad was preaching at Prague. But, struck by some remark of the preacher, he changed his whole course of life, became one of his most atten-

1 His own words are: Ego Conradus in Waldhausen professus ordinem S. Augustini canonicorum regularium et Lothomir Pragensis dioecesecos Plebanus verbum dei in civitate Pragensi quasi per annum continuum praedicassem in ecclesia S. Galli.

2 Nolens sanguinem animarum de manibus meis requiri, equidem in scripturis sanctis vidi fidelius, ut potui, pericula animarum futura.

tive and devout hearers, to be found always by his side; and Conrad often alluded to the change that had taken place in him as evidence of the power of transforming grace.[1]

Even the Jews often went to hear him preach. Some of his friends would have prevented this; but Conrad, who was zealous for the salvation of *all* human souls, and could not approve of this exclusion of the Jews, reminded his friends that, according to the prophecy of Isaiah, their conversion in great numbers was some time or other to be expected. They ought never to doubt of the power of the gospel and of divine grace. He would pleasantly remark that "if it was in the power of divine grace to change the worldly heart of a Slanko, why might it not also overcome the unbelief of the Jews."[2] He thus speaks of the matter himself: "It so happened that many Jews, of both sexes, attended my preaching, sitting and standing promiscuously in the crowd among the Christians; and it was told me that a number of Christians supposed that the Jews must be avoided, and wished to prevent them from attending my preaching for the future. I then said: I have heard that some of you have been keeping away the Jews, who were attentive hearers, from my sermons. I beg you not to do this again; for the last day is approaching, before which, according to Isaiah, all the Jews are to be converted. Peradventure some one of these may, by the grace of God, be converted." And to show that this was by no means impossible, he cites the example of Slanko.

In pointing beyond a mere outside Christianity to its true essence, in exposing the various ways in which men deceived themselves with regard to the demands of Christianity, the various means resorted to for the purpose of hushing the alarms of conscience, and bolstering up a life of immorality, he was led to contend earnestly against the influence of the mendicant friars,

1 Conrad says of him: Ille fuerat valde indisciplinatus ante adventum meum in Pragam. Ita quando civissae, quibus honisabat, vel quaecunque aliae sedebant in quadragesima in praedicatione, jaciebat super earum capillos. Etiam in principio adventus mei in Pragam fuit aliquamdiu inquietus; postea fuit conversus cum multis aliis complicibus suis ejusdem vanitatis, quod valde devote mecum sedebat in quadragesima ad sermonem.

2 The words of Conrad: De hoc juvene jocose dixi, arguens per locum a minori, sciens quod non aegre ferret, et quia bonus amicus meus esset, et de hoc gaudebat: Ex quo conversus est *ille*, posset etiam Judæus converti.

who by their mock-sanctity imposed on the multitude, while they encouraged and promoted the false reliance in various outward works; and in warning men against the false prophets who were to appear in the last times, he felt compelled to draw his illustrations chiefly from the mendicants. He spoke with great emphasis against every species of simony, but especially against that form of it which was stealthily practised under the garb of absolute poverty by the begging-monks. Simony he pronounced to be heresy. There was, as he thought, a still worse heresy than that of the *Pneumatomachi*, who declared the Holy Ghost to be a mere creature; namely when, by simony, the Holy Ghost was employed as a means of getting money. The former only made the Holy Ghost a ministrant creature to God the Father; but they who practised simony made the Holy Ghost their own spirit, their own minister.[1] He regarded it as no better than simony, to ask pay for taking in and nursing the sick, and to decline receiving young women or young men into the convents except for a certain stipulated sum. He had applied at first to Ernest, archbishop of Prague, and requested him to put a stop to this simony. But this prelate assured him that it was out of his power; most of the convents being exempted from his jurisdiction, and under the control of priors of the mendicant order.[2] No other course remained for him, therefore, but to lift up his voice against the evil, in his sermons and in his intercourse with men. He inveighed against the mock-sanctity of the monks, who endeavoured to deceive the simple to the great injury of their souls; and through weak-minded, bigoted females in particular, introduced their corrupting influence into families, procured legacies to be made to their order, and its superior holiness to be commended, so as to induce parents to give up to them their boys. "These persons"—he says—"often deceive the simple, by pretending to a holy poverty, putting on the garb of an hypocritical sanctity; and whilst, for outside show, they carry that devotion on their lips, which is not, I fear, in their hearts, they rob those who confess to

1 Illi enim Macedoniani creaturam et servum *dei* patris et filii spiritum sanctum delirando fatebantur. Isti vero eundem spiritum sanctum efficiunt *suum* servum, quia divendunt ipsum quasi adversarii.

2 This Conrad relates himself: Domino archiepiscopo Pragensi id ipsum significare, quod talibus, ne fierent, remedium adhiberet opportunum. Qui respondit, quod monasteria monialium fere omnia essent ab ejus cura in civitate Pragensi exempta, sed sub alis fratrum ordinum mendicantium, ut communiter essent.

them of what belongs rightfully, when they have done with it, to their heirs. But let these simple persons hear what our Lord threatens to such, in his parables (Matt. xxiii. 23)."[1] No man, he held, could be forced to be virtuous. All goodness must proceed from free choice and conviction. Hence he objected to the practice, customary with parents, of carrying their children to the convents, where they were to be put under a perpetual vow to the monastic life, though it was quite uncertain whether they would be fitted for it or willing to undertake it on arriving at mature years. "They only"—he said—"who are led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God. That which the Spirit only can effect, is not to be forcibly imposed upon one from without." We recognize, in all this, the Augustinian; one on whom the doctrines of Augustin had exerted a great and decided influence. He himself remarks, in clearing himself from the reproaches which were thrown on him for using such expressions: "Because I was informed that the people of Prague had been persuaded by those monks to vow the consecration to their orders of boys still in the mother's womb, and to give them the names of the saints of those orders, I spoke publicly against such a practice, except on the express condition that their children should be held to such vows only in case they met with their own concurrence when they came of age.[2] For otherwise it would inevitably be attended with danger to the souls of both children and parents." Therefore he held parents responsible for the injury which might accrue to their children, if such a mode of life was forced upon them contrary to their own wishes. He had nothing to say against the monastic life, in itself considered. But he made a distinction between this life and the strange offshoots from it, against which he felt it the more incumbent on him to warn men, in proportion to the high regard which he entertained for the institution. Referring to the remarks

1 Immo tales creberrime praetextu suae sanctae paupertatis et habitu simulatae sanctitatis simplices decipientes et eorum devotionibus, ore, sed ut timeo, non corde ostensis, confitentes, privant bonis suis, quibus post mortem deberent vivere haeredes eorum. Sed audiant, quid dominus talibus in figura similitudinis comminetur.

2 Quia homines civitatis Pragensis audiebam per praedictos fratres, ut pueri adhuc in ventris matrum existentes suis ordinibus voverent, procurari et nomina sanctorum vel sanctarum sui ordinis nominari, quae ne fierent ut potui publice prohibui, nisi si hoc pacto sui primum voluissent hoc votum, cum ad annos discretionis pervenerit suo libero arbitrio ratificare.

of Augustin, he declared, that while in monasticism, if it corresponded to its idea, was to be found the most perfect mode of Christian life; so in it, when degenerated, was also to be found the greatest wickedness. Refusing to retract what he had said on this point, but rather confirming it, he wrote: "I say and write what I never wrote, or said from the pulpit, before, moved to do this now by such an unwarranted contradiction, that he who has a son or friend whom he loves, and whose welfare he holds dear, should no more allow him to enter into one of these orders,—in which manifestly, and as it were by authority, owing to the corrupt influence of a bad custom, it has become necessary to live contrary to the rule of the orders and to the profession—than he who wants to cross the Danube, should voluntarily embark in a leaky craft, thereby exposing his life to danger."[1] And after quoting certain remarks of St Bernard, referring to the degeneracy of the monks, he adds: "But I say, O St Bernard, what would thy language be now, didst thou behold the mendicant friars sitting in those splendid palaces, which they own in spite of the apostolical prohibition!" It were better, he thinks, only for the sake of escaping corruption and securing salvation, to remain in the world; for, as well in the monastic life as in the world, Pure worship and undefiled before God and the Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world. To the monks, who trusted in the holiness of their order, he applied what John the Baptist had said in rebuking the theocratical pride of the Jews,—that God was able, out of these stones, to raise up children to Abraham. "No monk"—says he—"is entitled to hope that he shall be saved because the founder of his order was a holy man; it would be precisely the same as if I should hope in St Augustin, and expect to be made blessed by his holiness without any good works of my own." "I believe"—says he—"that if St Francis himself should find fault with them for their wickedness, he must prove, according to their own professions, to be a

1 Dico et scribo, quod prius nunquam scripsi vel dixi in ambone, tali contradictione indebita motus, quod quilibet habens puerum vel amicum diligens, quem velit salvari, videat, ne in aliquem ordinem ipsos intrare procuret, in quo manifeste et quasi jam ex auctoritate propter corruptelam pravae consuetudinis sit necesse vivere contra regulam ejusdem ordinis et professionem, attendens, quod nullus volens Danubium transire, sponte intraret navem corruptam, ubi tamen esset in periculo corpus.

bad man, and they would never acknowledge him as the founder of their order; so very far, alas! have they departed from the purity of their foundation, and from their original poverty." He distinguishes, indeed, the primitive mode of living among the mendicants, as laid down by their rule, from that which contradicted it; yet it is very evident, that he was very far from regarding the institution of the mendicant orders, in itself considered, as the highest degree of the imitation of Christ. On the contrary, he disputes the position, that such poverty corresponded to the original type of the life of Christ. He affirms that Christ never begged. In proof of this, he states that when Christ paid the tribute for himself and for Peter, he did not beg it, but caused it to be found in the mouth of the fish; that Christ was styled not the carpenter's son merely, but the carpenter; explaining the words, "Is not this the carpenter's son?" as if the people had said, We have not seen him studying, but at work with his father the carpenter. He offered to give sixty groats to any one who could cite a single passage from the New Testament, showing that Christ had ever begged.[1] He himself repented, as it would seem, of his earlier mode of life, which his order had imposed; for he says: "O, had I but known it ten years ago, I would then, for the glory of God, have devoted myself entirely to study; but from henceforth I will consecrate my whole life to study, to the cultivation of a prayerful spirit, and to preaching." He contests the notion, that it was a peculiarly holy and meritorious work to give alms to the monks, instead of providing for the support of the truly necessitous poor. "O,"—he writes—"what will the Lord say, in that day of fearful judgment, to those who, when they were not needy themselves, snatched away their alms from the truly poor, the real beggars. Assuredly will it be in his power to say—I was hungry and ye gave me no meat; ye took away from me what was to serve as my food. Much rather"—said he—"should we give to the poor and to the *true* beggars, than to a rich and strong man, who begs while he might work. And I believe"—he proceeds—"all men of sound understanding would agree with me in this; though not an individual would

1 Dixi, quod quicunque ex iis fuerit primus, qui ostenderit mihi ex scriptura canonica, Christum mendicasse, cujus rationes solvere non possim, dabo sibi unam sexagenariam grossorum pro cappa panni rudis.

say that we are bound to give to the rich man, rather than to the poor Lazarus; that we should give to those that riot at feasts, and leave to die, of hunger, the poor beggars who seek to feed themselves with the crumbs that fall from the table. He bore his testimony against the fraudful quackery carried on with pretended relics of saints. "The people"—said he—"often allow themselves to be imposed upon with relics. A head of St Barbara, it was reported, existed somewhere in Prussia; and yet many held that they had such a head in Prague." And he adds, in confirmation: "So true is it, that they often love the perishable bodies of saints more than their meritorious works for the sake of the kingdom of heaven; when the truth is that the saints do not make holiness, but holiness made the saints; therefore holiness should not be loved less than the saints."[1] He applies to them what Christ says of the Pharisees, who garnished the sepulchres of the murdered prophets, while in heart they resembled their murderers. The reason why they honoured the tombs of the prophets, Christ tells them, was that they found it a source of gain. They deceived the simple by this show of religion.[2] While Conrad prevailed on the usurers, who were converted under his sermons, to prove the sincerity of their repentance by returning the gains they had made from unlawful interest, to those whom they had robbed, directly contrary to this was the practice of the mendicants, who tranquillized the consciences of usurers, by inspiring in them a false confidence in absolution, because they ministered to their avarice. He could lay it to their charge, that they had absolved from all his sins, and buried with ceremonious pomp, a usurer who had never restored back his unlawful gains, though he had made a large donation to them.[3] He reproaches them with the folly of celebrating mass for him whose soul might, in all probability, be with that of the rich man in

1 Quod sicut verum est, quod saepe plus diligunt pereuntia sanctorum corpora, quam imitentur et diligantur propter coeleste regnum ipsorum merita, cum tamen sancti non fecerint sanctitatem, sed sanctitas sanctos. Unde sanctitas non minus quam sancti esset diligenda.

2 Quia sepulcra prophetarum pecuniam iis solvebant, simplices per hujusmodi speciem religionis decipiebant.

3 Conrad's words: Ipsum, postposita omnium conscientia, in ecclesia sua absolutum suo decreto ab omnibus peccatis suis, gloriose et cum magna processione fratrum altisone cantando per pontem apportatum sepelissent.

hell.[1] He says of the mendicants: "We may see those who would be pillars of the church, strolling about in the cities, or to the castles, and through the country, without returning to their convents for two or more months; and there is nothing which they preach more zealously than—'Give us, and we will pray for you.' Thus they sought only their own, and not the things which are Jesus Christ's, and laid the foundation of endless troubles in the church."[2] One effect of his own preaching, he tells us, was that the mendicant slost all their hearers.[3] He says that their preachers had often not more than four bigotted women, Beguins as they were called, to hear their German sermons.[4] But they made use of these women, who were so devoted to them, as tools to get up a party against Conrad, whom they hated. "Then I saw"—he writes—"that they whispered, in their corners, calumnious reports about my sermons and my doctrines, that they muttered against me, and through their Beguins inflamed the minds of the people with hostility to my doctrine; and that they declaimed against me in the public market-place," etc.[5] Applying to his own case the parable of the sheep and good shepherd, he says of his opponents: "Should they come into my fold, I do not believe that *my flock* would be led far astray by them; but *I* would give them a taste of the salt of God's word; for these sheep will not care for the barren and perhaps noxious pasturage which others would give them, but as I hope, will follow the voice of their shepherd, when they hear it, as the salt which cannot lose its savour."[6] The mendicant monks reproached him with having forsaken his parish, and

1 Non attendentes, quod anima illius cum divite epulone fuisset in inferno sepulta.

2 Eos, qui se dicunt columnas ecclesiae, per villas, civitates, castra discurrentes vidisses, sed infra duos menses vel quod amplius ad monasteria non redeuntes, et nil aliud ita ferventer sicut "Date nobis, et orabimus pro vobis" praedicantes, et tantum quae sua sunt, et non Jesu Christi quaerentes, et infinita scandala in ecclesia ponentes.

3 Videntes se ab omnibus auditoribus suis derelictos.

4 Alibi vel in suis monasteriis populum nullum, sed quatuor beginas vel quinque in sermonibus suis teutonicis, ut hodierna declamat evidentia.

5 Et per beginas suas homines inducere ad oppositionem doctrinae meae et in publico foro declamare, caet.

6 Non credo, quod amplius sinant se duci per ipsos oviculas meas, sed dabo eis de sale verbi dei, sicut potero ad lingendum, quia non curabunt infructuosa et forte noxia pascua aliorum, sed suum pastorem audientes, ut spero, vocem ejus sequentur tanquam sal non infatuandum.

made his appearance ere called for, as a preacher in Prague. But he met them by appealing to the divine call which had moved him to preach in Prague, characterizing these monks themselves, who would hinder another from preaching, as dumb dogs.[1] He says: "He who is afraid to speak the truth, is not a true preacher sent of God. Unmoved, therefore, will I praise the Word, O Lord, in thee, and not be afraid. I long after the glory of our Saviour." "While I am willing to answer them"—he says—"who say Christ has not sent me, I am greatly at a loss when I ask what the proof is of their own mission. For if we look at the heart and the conduct as the proof of those who are sent of God, it will be evident that by them the rules of Christ are not at all observed. For Christ said to his preachers, when he sent them forth, Freely ye have received, freely give. But no sooner have they a congregation, than they set up a money table to make money out of their hearers." When Conrad had thus turned against him the hatred of the mendicants, no pains were spared on their part to convict him of heresy, and expose him to persecution. They forgot the mutual jealousies and animosities which generally divided Dominicans and Franciscans, and entered into a league against their common enemy. He compared one of these coalitions with the alliance of Herod and Pilate against Christ.[2] As Conrad had won the warm esteem and affection of multitudes, his enemies, by their persecutions of him, drew the hatred of the people upon themselves, which they signified by frequently assaulting their agents, though never put up to this by Conrad. When they accused him of stirring up the people against them, he could reply to them with truth, that they had brought this shame upon themselves by their crafty plots against him, and would do so again, as often as they tried the same experiment.

In the year 1364, when the general of the Dominican order, who was at the same time papal legate, visited Prague, the two orders of the Dominicans and Franciscans, of whom we have just spoken, drew up in concert 29 articles, which they had extracted from his sermons, and placed them in the hands of the

1 Populum, quos tum etiam recedente me non multum curassent, cum omnes facti sint quasi canes muti.

2 His words are: Duo magni hostes sibi mutuo fuerunt conciliati.

archbishop of Prague, that he might be brought up for examination on these charges. The archbishop upon this convoked an assembly which was numerously attended; but, on the day appointed for the trial, no one dared to appear against Conrad as a public accuser. He afterwards composed a paper in defence of himself, of which we have freely made use in the preceding narrative. He showed, first, that his opponents had either exaggerated or misconstrued his language; then he repeated, for substance, what he had actually said, and what had induced his opponents to accuse him of heresy. When they complained that he disturbed everywhere the public peace, his reply was: "I say, that in my sermons I never aimed at disturbing the public peace, and never have disturbed it; I mean the peace of the good." He adverts to the example of Christ, who, in his intercourse with the Scribes and Pharisees, undoubtedly disturbed the peace; even as he said, I am not come to bring peace on the earth, but a sword. "When I am complained of, then, for disturbing such peace as this, I take it cheerfully, for our Lord says: 'So persecuted they the prophets which were before you,'" etc. He refers to the zeal of Elisha against the golden calves set up by Jeroboam, and remarks: "These golden calves, many in our time would be strongly opposed to have thus thrown away. They would prefer to have them used to decorate the bodies of the saints, and thus add to their gains.[2] O, how many are there, who would suffer a great deal for their order, but who could not be induced to suffer even a little in the way of preaching the pure truth." Still later in the season of the same year, the Archduke Rudolph of Austria, being on a visit to Prague, wished to get Conrad back again to Vienna; but the latter could not be induced to go, being fully persuaded that it was his duty to remain still in the blessed circle of his labours in Prague, whatever persecution he might have to encounter. He pled the obligations under which he had been laid by the emperor as his excuse for not accepting the invitation.[3] Thus Conrad continued

1 Ipsi sibi ipsis causa horum opprobriorum praeteritorum et interea secutorum et etiam futurorum per suam indiviosam et malitiosam mei vexationem,

2 His words: Quos nostri temporis quidam nequaquam sic abjicerent, imo inde sanctorum corpora, ut inde consequerentur majora lucra, vestirent.

3 His words: Me hoc facere non posse, qui per dominum imperatorem essem beneficiatus.

to labour in Prague, finally as parish priest of the Teyn church, till his death, which happened in 1369.

If the two persons of whom we have just spoken were distinguished for their activity as practical men, and prepared the way by this means for the reformatory tendencies in the Bohemian church, the same thing cannot indeed be said of Matthias of Janow; but his inferiority as a practical man was more than compensated by the wide influence he exerted through his writings and by his scientific exposition of principles. In his works we may find not only the reformatory ideas which passed over from him to Huss, but also the incipient germs of those Christian principles which at a later period were unfolded, in Germany, by Luther, although the latter never came directly under the influence of Matthias of Janow. Of Huss it may be said with more truth, that he fell behind Matthias of Janow, than that he passed beyond him. Matthias of Janow, son of Wenzel of Janow, a Bohemian knight, had resided six years at the University of Paris, pursuing philosophical and theological studies; hence he was called the Parisian master (magister Parisiensis). But the man who contributed most to the particular shaping of his later religious and theological development was Militz, a man the general impression of whose life filled him with such profound and enthusiastic admiration. It is plain from his writings, that he had travelled much in Germany and in Italy; and that he had visited Rome. He shows a familiar acquaintance with the relations and the customs of different countries. Thus, in speaking of his residence in Lucca, under Pope Urban VI., he mentions a law which he there heard promulgated, directing that unmarried females should neither wear ornaments of gold or silver, nor any dress offending against the strictest rules of moral propriety.[1] He seems in the earlier part of his life to have been given to the prevailing notions and tendencies of his time; until, perhaps through the influence of Militz, he became penetrated with that holy fire, as he expresses it, which left him no rest.[2]

1 Sed et in Lucca solemni in Lombardia civitate tempore papae Urbani VI., audivi publice per vicos et plateas voce praeconis proclamari, quod mulieres innuptae non deferant aurum et argentum, nec non alias quascunque vestes impudicas et profanas. In his book hereafter to be cited.

2 We shall presently cite these words more at length.

In still another place, he speaks of this revolution in his religious experience, stating how, in the light of God's word, the corruption of the church of his time, by which he himself was affected, first became clearly apparent to him, and how, by the grace of God, he had been rescued from it. "Once"—says he—"my mind was encompassed by a thick wall; I thought of nothing but what delighted the eye and the ear, till it pleased the Lord Jesus to draw me as a brand from the burning. And while I, worst slave to my passions, was resisting him in every way, he delivered me from the flames of Sodom, and brought me into the place of sorrow, of great adversities and of much contempt. Then first I became poor and contrite; and searched with trembling the word of God. I began to admire the truth in the Holy Scriptures, to see how, in all things, it must be exactly fulfilled; then first I began to wonder at the deep wiles of Satan, to see how he darkened the minds of all, even those who seemed to think themselves wisest." After describing how he thus came to understand the corruption of the church,[1] he says: "And there entered me, that is, into my heart, a certain unusual, new, and powerful fire, but a very blessed fire, and which still continues to burn within me, and is kindled the more in proportion as I lift my soul in prayer to God and to our Lord Jesus Christ the crucified; and it never abates nor leaves me, except when I forget the Lord Jesus Christ, and fail to observe the right discipline in eating and drinking; then I am enveloped in clouds, and unfitted for all good works, till, with my whole heart and with deep sorrow, I return to Christ, the true physician, the severe judge, he who punishes all sin, even to idle words and foolish thoughts."[2] And he moreover intimates that, before this,

1 Et piissimus Jesus elevavit mentem meam, ut cognoscerem homines absorptos a vanitate; et tunc legens intellexi lucide abominationem desolationis, stantem late, nimis alte et firmiter in loco sancto cae. De sacerdot. et monach. carnalium abominatione, in Husse's Works, Norib. 1558, i. fol. 398, p. 2, cap. 22.

2 Et ingressus est in me, id est in pectus meum, quidam ignis etiam corporaliter subtilis, novus, fortis et inusitatus, sed valde dulcissimus: et continuatus usque modo, et semper tanto magis succenditur, quanto magis elevor in oratione ad deum et dominum Jesum Christum crucifixum; et nunquam recedit, vel remittitur, nisi quando obliviscor Christi Jesu, quando relaxo disciplinam in comedendo vel potando. Ibid. This extract is taken from a piece in the above cited work of Janow, which may be found, under the title De sacerdotum et monachorum carnalium abominatione, printed among the works of Huss, and under his name, i. fol. 376 seq. I

he shared in an opinion which belonged to the common church spirit, though a new light dawned afterwards on his mind; he thought, namely, before he had experienced that internal change in his views and feelings, with the majority of the clergy, that the laity ought to be kept from frequent participation of the Lord's supper. He himself says: "Concerning the jealousy and pride of those clergymen who are displeased with the frequent participation of the Lord's supper by the laity, I am silent; since I was myself, in like manner, under the influence of such feelings in former days; and I am conscious that I was, myself, oftentimes actuated by such jealousy when I, in like manner, dissuaded lay persons from such frequent enjoyment of the communion. I had not, as yet, experienced the singular light on this subject which came to me from above."[1] These words certainly do not refer merely to a change in his views on a particular point, but to one of a much deeper and more radical character; for it is evident from them, that at an earlier period of his life, he was affected with the same spiritual pride, the same contempt of the laity which others had; was conscious of being an utter stranger to those ideas, that dawned later upon him, with regard to the universal priesthood of Christians. In the year 1381, he became a prebendary at Prague; and the experience which he here gained of the worldliness of the higher clergy in the meetings of the cathedral chapter, is alluded to by himself, where he complains of the noisy squabbles of the procurators and advocates; "which"—says he—"any one will have it in his power to witness who is ever employed in their consistories."[2] It was his particular business to preside over the confessional, where doubtless would be manifested his great zeal for the spiritual

was betrayed into a mistake when I made use of this extract as belonging to Huss, in my account of the life of that reformer, in my "Kléine Gelegenheitschriften." Berlin, 1829, S. 223.

1 Taceo super hoc, de invidia et superbia talium, quibus vexantur, cum indignantur de communione frequente a plebejis, quia talibus fui obnoxius similiter, et me ipsum agitatum pluries invidia recognovi, cum similiter talem frequentem communionem sacramenti dissuadebam plebejis; adhuc non eram singulari lumine super hoc de excelso visitatus.

2 Lites, contentiones, strepitus,—quod videre poterit, qui in consistoriis illorum fuerit aliquando occupatus. See the fragment from the work of Matth. of Janow about to be mentioned, which wrongly goes under the name of Huss, in his work De regno, populo, vita et moribus Antichristi, cap. 21, fol. 374, p. 2.

good of souls, and where he had great opportunity to inform himself more minutely of the good or bad in all classes of society, and of the religious wants of the people. That he did not fail to make the most of it is apparent from the observations which he has recorded in a work of his presently to be mentioned. He died before the end of the century, in the year 1394.

The work from which we get the clearest insight into the spirit and influence of Matthias of Janow, is a piece of his own which still remains, in great part,[1] buried in manuscripts, entitled *De regulis veteris et novi Testamenti.* The exegetical matter forms the smallest part of the whole. It is chiefly taken up with reflections on the history of the times and hints concerning the future, based on the rules of the Old and New Testaments, on the prophetical elements which they contain. Although there is a great deal in the details which is arbitrary, particularly in the apocalyptic calculations, yet grand prophetic glances into the future are also to be found. He pourtrays the utter corruption of the church in all its parts, and explains the causes of it. His full intuition of the present is here presented to view. It is not a coherent exposition: it seems to be made up of several independent treatises composed at different times. Hence we may notice repetitions; certain fundamental ideas are ever turning up again. As a chronological characteristic we may notice, for example, that in one place seven years are supposed to be expunged after the beginning of the great papal schism, which would bring it down to the year 1385; but, in other places, we find him referring to the synod held in Prague, in 1389, of which we shall speak hereafter. Matthias of Janow himself, speaking of the motives which induced him to write this work, says: "The Lord Jesus instructed me how to write all this which relates to the present condition of priests, that is, the carnal ones, and which throws light on the character of these times; but what the end is in which all this is to result, he only knows who set me to work. And he sent me his spirit who shoots the fire into my bones and into my heart, leaving me no rest till I expose the hidden

1 All except the fragment above cited and published under the name of Huss. Some interesting extracts from the work have been recently published by P. Jordan, in his paper, "Die Vorläufer des Hussitenthums in Böhmen."

shame of the mother of harlots (the corrupt church as symbolized in Revelation)."[1] He has many things to complain of in the clergy; that they were absorbed in worldly business, governed by worldly motives; that they neglected spiritual things; that the least of all their concerns was the study of the Bible and of the old church-teachers. He speaks of them as "Men who knew nothing of the spirit of Jesus the crucified, who had never meditated day and night on the law of the Lord;—carnal-minded priests. They are men"—he proceeds—"who are not wholly devoted to the study of the Holy Scriptures, who have not been instructed in them from their youth, yet, for all this, they boldly stand forth as teachers, because perhaps they possess a certain gift of elocution; and they provide themselves with collections of sermons, postills for every day in the year, and so, without any further search into the Holy Scriptures, they hold forth those current homilies, preaching with great ostentation. They are people who know nothing about the Bible. Such persons do not preach from devotion, and from joy in the Divine Word, nor from zeal to edify the people; but because this is the business assigned to them, or because they are fond of making a display of their skill in speaking, or because they are hunting after popularity, and find gratification in being favoured and honoured by the people. So they have recourse to their collections of sermons, or put together fine words, and furnish out their discourses with stories, and with promises of large indulgences." It was already objected to the preachers of reform, to Janow, and men of a kindred spirit, that they exposed to the people, in the spoken language of the country, the wickedness of the clergy and monks, thus injuring their reputation. In defending himself against this reproach, Janow says, alluding to the words of Christ, (Matt. xvi. 6): "Here we find plainly refuted, those who in their sermons say the vices of the regular clergy and monks ought not to be exposed in discourses held in the spoken language of the country." The clergy and monks were not a little exasperated by such admoni-

1 Dominus Jesus instituit me ad scribendum ea omnia, quae contingunt statum praesentem sacerdotum, puta carnalium, et quae explicant qualitatem horum temporum; ad quem autem finem hoc perveniat, ipse solus novit, qui me in id posuit; et misit me spiritus ejus, qui mittit ignem in ossibus meis et in meo pectore, et quietum esse non sinit, quin revelem filium iniquitatis et perditionis, et quin denudem ac discooperiam abdita decoris fornicariae mulieris.

tory discourses to the people. This preaching, they said, made them contemptible and odious to the people; as if they themselves did not know or want to know the course pursued by Jesus the crucified; for he *purposely* exposed before the masses of the people the hypocrisy and wickedness of the religious orders of the teachers and priests, and exhorted his disciples to beware of their doctrines, although these priests were filled with rage and took the utmost offence at this. He offers as reasons for pursuing this course with the people, that it was necessary in order that the devout clergy and monks might not suffer injury from being confounded with those others, in order that the piety of the former might shine forth more conspicuously in contrast with the wickedness of the latter, in order that these latter might by such public exposure be led to repentance, in order that others might be put on their guard against the infection of their example. Like distempered sheep they should be separated from the sound, lest other Christians should fall into the same corruption. In remarking upon the words of Christ relative to the sending forth of the angels before the day of judgment (Matt. xiii 41), which he refers to the sending forth of messengers or preachers, in the last times, for the purpose of purifying the church from its dross, he says: It is to subserve also another purpose, to keep the simple people from following after ravening wolves, to make them certain of the guides whom they should adhere to, and of those whose counsels they should avoid; and, again, to remove from the sinful laity every such ground of excuse for their vices, as they plead when they say to those who correct them, do not the monks and the clergy even the same?—On the other side it was maintained, that even in wicked ecclesiastics their office should be respected; no man could be permitted to set up himself as judge over them, contrary to the rules of order; and, in proof of this, the appeal was made to Matt. xxii. 2, 3. To this he replies: Such language of reproof is pointed expressly against hypocrites, who enter not by the door into the sheepfold. All such are thieves and robbers. Hypocrites will not punish and betray one another. They can be known as such only by the spiritually minded. They do not know themselves. Christ, in the passage already referred to, (Matt. xvi. 6), exhorts to watchfulness. Janow describes it as one of the cunning tricks of the arch

enemy to persuade men that antichrist is still to come, when, in truth, he is now present and so has been for a long time; but men are less on their guard against him, when they look for him as yet to come. "Lest"—says he—"the abomination of desolation," (Matt. xxiv. 15), should be plainly manifest to men, he has invented the fiction of another abomination still to come, that the church, plunged still deeper in error, may pay homage to the fearful abomination which is present, while she pictures to herself another which is still in the future.[1] It is a common, everyday fact, that antichrists go forth in endless numbers, and still they are looking forward for some other and future antichrist." As to the person of antichrist, he affirms, that it was neither to be a Jew, nor a Pagan; neither a Saracen, nor a worldly tyrant persecuting Christendom. All these had been already; hence they could not so easily deceive. Satan must invent some new method of attacking Christianity. He then defines antichrist as follows: "He is and will be a man who opposes Christian truth and the Christian life in the way of deception; he is and will be the most wicked Christian, falsely styling himself by that name, assuming the highest station in the church, and possessing the highest consideration, arrogating dominion over all ecclesiastics and laymen; one who, by the working of Satan, knows how to make subservient to his own ends and to his own will the corporations of the rich and wise in the entire church; one who has the preponderance in honours and in riches, but who especially misappropriates the goods of Christ, the Holy Scriptures, the sacraments, and all that belongs to the hopes of religion, to his own aggrandisement and to the gratification of his own passions; deceitfully perverting spiritual things to carnal ends, and in a crafty and subtle manner employing what was designed for the salvation of a Christian people, as means to lead them astray from the truth and power of Christ." It is easy to see how Matthias of Janow might intend under this picture to represent the entire secularised hierarchy. It was not to be imagined that antichrist would form a particular sect, or particular disciples and apostles. Nor would he come upon the church preaching

1 Ne tamen ipsa abominatio reveletur, fingit aliam abominationem affuturam, ut per hoc amplius immittat ecclesiam in errorem, quatenus sic horrendam abominationem venerans atque colens, nihilominus unam aliam futuram fabuletur.

his own name, in the open and obvious manner with which Mohammed spread abroad his doctrines; that would be a tyranny too strikingly apparent, not at all fitted to deceive mankind. Antichrist must be more cunning than all that. His organs must stand forth in the name of Christ, and profess to be his ministers. He was thus to deceive men under the mask of Christianity.[1] The multitude of carnal men, led on by the most subtle artifices of wicked spirits, had been brought to think that, in following fables, they were pursuing the right way; to believe that in persecuting Christ's believers, or Christ and his power, they were persecuting antichrist and the false doctrines of his agents, just as it happened with those Jews and Pagans who called Christ a deceiver, and put him and his apostles to death, supposing that by so doing they did God service. Thus too the actual antichrists would dream of another antichrist to come. Commenting on 1 John iv. 3,[2] he thus addresses the Christians of his time: "Every spirit who dissolves Christ, is antichrist. Jesus is all power, all wisdom, and all love. Every Christian, therefore, who from design, either in great or in small, in a part or in the whole, dissolves this, dissolves Jesus; for he destroys and dissolves God's power, God's wisdom and love; and so, in the mystical sense, he is antichrist. An antichrist is every evil spirit, who in any way, directly or indirectly, opposes himself to the Christian faith and Christian manners among Christians. Although Christ is eternal, and therefore all opposition to the divine being may be regarded as in a certain sense opposition to Christ, still, in the proper sense, he thinks there was no antichrist before the incarnation.[3] Hence the devil, although a liar and murderer from the beginning, yet first began to be Christ's murderer, and antichrist, at the beginning of the Christian church; but not everywhere, but only in the church which is the body and the kingdom of Christ.

1 Non est autumandum, quod isdem antichristus congregaret sibi aliquam sectam singularem, vel discipulos et apostolos, suis iniquis studiis consentientes, sic ut notorie et publice ecclesiam invadet, atque verbo suo et praedicatione sui nominis in populis manifesto gentes per se seducet, veluti fecit Machometus in Saracenis; non faciet tali modo, nam hoc fieret tyrannice solum et nimis manifeste, vel stolide et rude.

2 After the Vulgate: Et omnis spiritus, qui solvit Jesum, ex deo non est. Et hic est antichristus, de quo audistis quoniam venit, et nunc jam in mundo est.

3 Sed non fuit antichristus, quia tunc adhuc non erat Christus, quia secundum modum loquendi logice, licet ista propositio sit vera, Christus semper fuit, tamen haec est vera, ante incarnationem filii dei non fuit antichristus.

Before the time of Christ's appearance, Satan did not need many arts to maintain his dominion over men. For Satan had already brought mankind once under his yoke; and strongly armed he kept watch over his palace, (Luke xi. 21); his goods were in peace, and he needed not give himself much trouble or use much deception. But when Christ appeared, and the Spirit was poured out upon men in seven-fold gifts, (compare Isaiah xi. 2), when everything visible and invisible was made ministrant to their salvation, (where he refers to Romans viii. 38), the case was altered. And as the evil spirit was now disarmed and laid bare by Christ, he must summon to his aid the collective host of most malignant spirits, and employ their busy and cunning natures in the work of deceiving and warring against the saints of God. "And so he has continued to do down to the present day. Nothing is weaker than Satan when exposed to the light.[1] He works through worthless monks; carnal priests; the wise of this world; great teachers; for these are his most efficient tools of mischief." Applying, to his own times, the passage in 2 Thess. ii. 9, he seeks to show, that in those times also, antichrist deceived and drew men to himself by false miracles, wonders wrought by Satanic agency, thus turning the love of the miraculous to his own ends. "Our modern hypocrites"—says he—"are so fully possessed of the seven spirits, that there is nothing they can approve, in deed or word, however otherwise profitable or commendable, unless they see signs and wonders. And, in truth, they ask for signs more than even the Jews did; thus showing that they are a still more perverse and adulterous generation than were the Jews in the time of Christ. This is hid from us, that for these many years genuine miracles have ceased to be wrought by the faithful; and especially now, in the time of antichrist, for the trial of their faith." He supposes that as faith was to maintain itself in the time of antichrist, under trials, miracles could not be given any longer for its support; false miracles only were to be permitted for the trial of faith. And then he says: "But Satan and his instruments are allowed to perform miracles by demoniacal agencies, on account of them that perish because they would not receive the love of the truth." In another

1 Nihil imbecillius diabolo denudato.

place, he says: God suffers many works to be done by the agency of Satan, that hypocrites, in spite of their lukewarm and sensual life, may receive honour from men, and other simple ones may be drawn over by such wonders to their side. And the more such wonders are done in the name of Christ, through images and relics of saints, or in holy places, the more dangerous they are, on account of their greater influence in misleading the simple into false doctrines, so as to neglect the truth of the sacraments of the church, and to surrender themselves to fables and human ordinances, and the superstition of sellers in the house of God. Such delusions, he thinks, Satan was allowed to practice, particularly on account of those unthankful Christians, who were ashamed of the truth and humility of Christ, and of the opprobrium of his cross, despising the sacraments and especially the body and blood of Christ; and even the Holy Scriptures had become to them common and contemptible as if they were a fable, or a very lovely song.[1] Therefore had the devil obtained from the Lord so much power to deceive; but only in secret, only in the mystery of antichrist; so that his ministers should lie in the name of Christ, and that their miracles should be wrought through the image of Christ, and through the bones and other relics of saints. "For, before God I ask you, how can any faithful Christian wonder, if Satan receives power to execute divine judgment on evil-doers, that his lying wonders should be wrought even through images or the bones of the saints, when power was given him over Christ in the temptation?"

The prediction in the second epistle to the Thessalonians (ii. 3) relative to the falling away which should come first, Janow supposes had been already accomplished in the moral falling away. "Faith"—he says—"is styled *fides formata* because it is made up of all the virtues. For it requires all other virtues in connection with itself, and is kept fresh and sound by every virtue.[2] Hence it follows, that a falling away from the faith consists especially in the admission of every kind of sin, and the omission of every kind of virtue; and because we see, on the

1 Verbum dei quoque et omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata facta iis est nimis communis et inveterata et levis, tanquam fuit fabulae vel canticum, quod dulciter sonat.

2 Fides Jesu formata ideo dicta, quia componitur ex omni virtute, vel quia correquirit et integratur ex omni virtute.

whole, at the present day, in the time of antichrist, all the virtues neglected among Christian people."[1] He holds to a slow and gradual evolution of the two kingdoms of Christ and antichrist, side by side. The destruction of antichrist, and the multiplication of the true witnesses of Jesus Christ, were to take place in a gradual manner, beginning from that present time, till all should be carried into fulfilment. The time had begun in the year 1340; where we are to observe, that Satan had been gradually working, through antichrist as his instrument, for a long period of time, introducing evil under the appearance of good among the people of God, turning good customs into abuse, diffusing more widely, every day, his principal errors. While Satan, then, was thus gradually to introduce the mysteries of his antichrist into the church, keeping his toils concealed; so, on the other hand, the Lord Christ, gradually manifesting himself in his beloved disciples, was at length, before the final judgment, to reveal himself in a great multitude of preachers. The spiritual revelation of Christ, through his genuine organs, the spiritual annihilation of antichrist by the same, and a new illumination of the church, were to prepare it for the last personal appearance of Christ, and precede that event. In this spiritual sense he understood much of that which is said concerning the victory of Christ over antichrist, and concerning the signs of Christ's appearance. Thus following Militz, he referred what Christ says respecting the sending forth of the angels to separate the good from the bad, to the sending forth of the true messengers of the faith, inspired preachers, who should effect a moral separation of the people in the corrupt church, so that the simple should no longer follow after ravening wolves, but know to whom they should adhere, and whose councils they should avoid, so that every excuse might be taken away from sinning laymen, who were wont to say to their reprovers, Why accuse me of this or that sinful action? Do not monks and priests even the same? Accordingly he says the expression that Christ will destroy antichrist by the breath of his mouth, is not to be understood literally, but spiritually: that he will quicken, by his

1 Sequitur, quod discessio a fide maxime sit per admissionem cujuslibet peccati et per omissionem cujusque virtutis, et quia in summa hodie videmus in tempore antichristi fieri omissionem omnis virtutis in populo Christiano.

Spirit, his elect priests and preachers, filling them with the spirit of Elias and of Enoch, with the spirit of zeal and of innocence, with the spirit of a glowing zeal and of penitence, with the spirit of activity and of devotion; that he will multiply them in number and send forth his angels once more through the world, to banish all troubles and grievances from his kingdom, the Spirit of Christ working through them, most inwardly and effectually, kindling life in the dry bones, quickening anew the dead faith of many over the wide field of the church, so that the bones, clothed with flesh and blood, should awake to new life in the faith of the Son of God.[1] "And bound with each other in the unity of the life of Jesus, many should come together and be held in union by the cords of a glowing love; and such the communities would love and would follow." Speaking of the signs of these times, he says: "As John the Baptist pointed away to Christ, so these signs point away impressively with their fingers to antichrist, already coming; they point to him now and will point to him still more; they have revealed him, and will reveal him, till the Lord shall destroy him with the breath of his mouth; and he will consume him by the brightness of his new revelation, until Satan is finally crushed under his feet. The friends of Christ, however, will destroy him, will rob him of his trade, the company of the preachers of Jesus Christ, united and bound together by the love and wisdom which come from God." All holy Scripture—he says—predicts, that before the end of the world the church of Christ shall be reformed, renovated, and more widely extended; that she shall be restored to her pristine dignity, and that still, in her old age, her fruitfulness shall increase.[2] "This is what most perfectly accords"—he says—"with other passages of Scripture, in the Gospels and the Prophets, which declare that, at the end of the world, the church of Christ shall be reformed, that Sodom shall be restored to her former dignity, and that Elias shall come and restore again all things." We

1 Quod dominus Jesus inspirabit suos electos sacerdotes et praedicatores, replens eos spiritu Eliae et Enoch, spiritu zeli et innocentiae, spiritu fervoris et poenitentiae, spiritu strenuitatis et devotionis, multiplicabitque tales et mittet adhuc semel per mundum universum suos angelos, ut colligant de regno suo omnia scandala, spiritu Jesu intime per eos operante et inflammante ossa arida, fidem mortuam multorum.

2 This passage recurs again in the paper De regno etc. Antichristi, printed in the works of Huss (i. fol. 368), except that in this copy a great deal is mutilated.

should here remark that Matthias, in this place, discards the old opinion that the prophet Elias was to come literally to prepare the way for Christ's second appearance, which had its advocates among his contemporaries; and maintains that this re-appearance of Elias was to be understood only in the spiritual sense; as he says: "Thinkest thou that divine truth, in this passage, points to the person of Elias, or rather to some other one filled with the spirit of Elias and enriched with his peculiar gifts? I believe, according to my own understanding of the place, that in these words the truth did not mean literally Elias, in the person of Elias, or not him alone, but rather the spirit and the power of Elias in the multitude of holy preachers and teachers, through whom his overflowing spirit should restore all things, and that this coming was to animate the dry bones. Were the former Elias to come bodily from paradise, as some have for a long time believed he would, it does not appear how one individual could run to and fro through the whole world, and by his own pains and preaching be able to restore the whole company of the elect, for this would surpass his power; but it is possible only through the omnipotent Spirit of Jesus, that fills the whole world, who requires for his work not so much that literal Elias, since he can raise up from the very stones, from pagans and laymen, sons of Abraham, many Eliases: unless perhaps it might be said, it would be of use for Elias to come in person, in order that ignorant and negligent men might be convinced by his testimony. Yet this argument, as it seems to me, cannot hold, because holy Scripture gives answer, in those words addressed to the rich man in hell, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one should rise from the dead (Luke xvi. 31). But suppose the case that Elias, coming in person, should give testimony to the truth; yet this would diminish the value of faith in the appropriation of Christianity, or indeed destroy its whole significance."[1] We see from these words, how profoundly this man understood the nature of faith as an internal fact of the temper, the bent of the disposition to the godlike, where the act of apprehending in the act of surrendering one's self to the god-

1 Et nunc dato, quod Elias personaliter veniens veritati testimonium perhiberet, et inde videtur, et in religione Christiana excolenda, tunc jam per hoc meritum fidei evacuaretur, aut utique eidem detraheretur.

like takes the place of a constraining evidence; as an affair of the will, which cannot be forced by any power from without, by any proofs that convince the understanding. He then proceeds: "Holy Scripture abundantly testifies that, in the last times, no miracles shall be wrought in proof of the truth; for the faith in Jesus shall then have reached its perfection, and so shall be preserved. Hence, too, all miracles have ceased on the part of God's saints, and the fabulous portents and prodigies of antichrist have multiplied. No reason therefore remains, why the person of Elias should take upon himself the labour of restoring all that is in the condition of decline." And in this same connection he mentions Militz as one in whom Elias had re-appeared. He says that the parables of Christ relating to the process of preparation for the kingdom of God, the parables of the leaven and of the grain of mustard seed, would find their application, as in the primitive, so also once more and pre-eminently in the last times.

We will now endeavour to pourtray more minutely the character of Matthias of Janow, by observing how he attacks the corruptions of the church in its different relations and branches, tracing back these polemics to the fundamental intuitions bearing within them the germ of the reformation as it was afterwards realized by Luther. He looked upon the church as an organism in which all the members should be connected with each other according to their several gradations, and should co-operate together, like the head and different members of the human body. But now the case was quite otherwise; when the popes had haughtily placed themselves above the bishops, and taken all the power into their own hands, and stood in closer connection with the princes than with the bishops. "In the communities"—says he—"the pope should first of all be leagued, and should be one hand with the bishops, and take special care that the bishops rightly discharge the functions of their office, and that they are quite familiar with those functions. But in fact he is more closely leagued with kings and princes, exalting himself above measure over those who, jointly with him, preside over the governance of the church. Besides this; breaking up the regular and orderly connection throughout the whole body, he has usurped to himself the distribution of benefices which belonged to the bishops. Neither do the bishops stand in that beautiful relation

in which they ought to stand to the parish priests; but they place themselves too far above them, and would rule over the clergy. Thus the parish priests stand at a farther remove from the bishops than is right or profitable for the church; they are strangers and unknown to them. The bishops themselves have their most familiar intercourse with the barons of the land, with the princes, and with their own great canonicals, and the rich men of the world. They do not take all suitable pains for the good, useful, and wholesome placing of the parish priests, but are taken up with managing the affairs of the lords, and with other temporal and civil concerns; while other bishops are so wholly in *their own* devotion, as to bestow but little attention on their sons the parish priests. And hence arises great harm both to soul and body. Such sacrifices of private devotion were not well-pleasing to God." He describes the peace which they would conclude between themselves and God alone; the long psalms; the tender and perhaps tearful devotion; of all this he says: "Consider, how little acceptable it can be to the Lord, when he says to Peter, Lovest thou me more than these? (John xxi.), and, Feed my sheep; but did not say to him, Obtain peace for thyself in thy private residence. So again, the hearts of the parish ministers and priests are not bound up in true union with their communities, but are divided from them by many vain and frivolous concerns; especially do they hug closely to wealth, to honours, and their own emolument. For they too"—he says of them—"put themselves too much above their communities, are too much estranged from them; have too much respect for persons." He says the people should be subject to the priests and the princes, to the former in spiritual, to the latter in temporal things; but the people are disobedient to the clergy, not so much through the fault of the people or of the princes, as through the fault of the licentious and carnal priests. "First"—says he—"because we priests, descending to the love of this world, and given to fleshly pleasures, were robbed of the strength with which we were armed from above, as Sampson of old was robbed by a harlot of his hair, we have become weak and foolish, like the kings and princes, and so contemptible to the people and to mankind; and hence the fear and veneration of the communities towards us has been extinguished, and the people are already

discontented with being subject to us and with obeying us; so that where they cannot help themselves, they obey us only with disgust, because we are carnal and look only after our own comfort. Hence we have become pusillanimous and effeminate, exercising meditation but faintly and lukewarmly, and giving way from fear to those who invade our rights and liberties; and thus by degrees our authority and the weight of our influence has become nothing; the people have broke loose from it, since we take pleasure in the society of the friends of this world, and in having a share in whatever they love. And because *we* have not obeyed our God, with good reason we are not ourselves obeyed by those who are under us; and because *we* have forgotten Jesus the crucified, the people have also forgotten *our* great power and *our* great authority; and because we have rejected the cross of Christ and its reproach which was our greatest glory, we have ourselves lost thereby our own good name. And because we sought the glory and honour of this world, the greatest abomination in the sight of the Lord Jesus the crucified, and of the church of the faithful, therefore are we become objects of abhorrence to him and to his saints, and in particular to the holy church militant; therefore has the left hand of the church, the secular arm, become too fat, and gained too great an extension in its flesh, the fleshly persons belonging to it; while the right hand, the spiritual authority and jurisdiction, is greatly wasted and weakened; and therefore has the right hand of the church, which should be filled with spiritual treasures, suffered itself to be filled rather, like the left hand, with the pleasures and honours of this world. To unite both together was impossible, as no man can serve two masters." He refers to the commission of the apostles, who were directed to take nothing for their journey, and to Peter's words—Silver and gold have I none. He endeavours to make it plain by a comparison, how much depended on the character and ability of the *parish priest.* "We are to notice here"—says he—"that the arm, however strong in itself, is still without any great power of lifting or holding, unless the *fingers* of the *hand* are strong."[1] Were the arm wounded, if but the

1 Unde hic est advertendum, quod omnis manus, quantumcunque sit fortis et robusta in brachiis suis, tenere tamen multa non potest vel comprehendere, nisi per summitates manus, vel per fortes et integros digitos.

fingers were healthy and strong, the hand would still be capable of doing a good deal, capable of managing weapons, etc.[1] He uses this figure to illustrate the great importance of the parish priests to the prosperity of the church; and the necessity of multiplying them. Even though the popes and the bishops should be negligent, weak, or in other respects incapable, as they often really were, yet if this company of the devout priests, who were brought into immediate intercourse with the communities themselves, remained sound and capable, the folds of Christ would neither be scattered, nor neglected, nor subjugated by their enemies;[2] because the Lord Jesus, through whose power alone these priests bring forth fruit in labouring for the salvation of souls, stands by them equally as well, replenishing his fellow-labourers and faithful ones, in equally as peculiar and direct a manner, with all the fulness of his grace and power."[3] It is evident from these words, that although Matthias left the papacy with the entire hierarchical fabric untouched, yet an altogether different view of the nature of church governance lay at the basis of his ideas concerning the best condition of the church. The guidance of the church by means of the word, proceeding from the lips of *the parochial clergy*, was with him the main thing. He thought lightly of all the rest.

One reason of the corruption of the church appeared to him to be the overloading it with human ordinances, the excessive multiplication of ecclesiastical laws. Let us hear what he has to say on this subject. The multitude of commands and prohibitions is a wily trick of Satan to bring men under his yoke, and to entangle their souls; since it invariably happens that the inferior clergy will, among the communities, do many things which are forbidden by their superiors, and omit to do many things

1 Et si digiti essent sani et fortes, manente alias tamen manu laesa in brachiis et vulnerata, adhuc tota manus esset capax armorum vel bonorum plurimorum.

2 Dato casu, ut plurimum fieri assolet, quod jam brachium episcoporum Romanorum vel alii episcopi inveniantur negligentes, debiles vel quovis modo vulnerati, tamen si haec multitudo sanctorum sacerdotum applicata immediate plebibus integra et fortis manserit, tunc greges Christi Jesu adhuc non negligentur neque dispergentur neque expugnabuntur ab inimicis.

3 Quia dominus Jesus ipsis assistit aeque bene et aeque proprie et immediate cum suis cooperatoribus et suis fidelibus cum omni plenitudine gratiarum et virtute, cujus solius potestate isti sacerdotes fructum afferunt et in salute animarum proficiunt et operantur.

which are prescribed by the ordinances of their superiors; especially when these ordinances are become so multiplied, that to know them all, it would be necessary to provide one's self with many large volumes and to expend a great deal of money and time in studying them, ere it would be possible to have an exact knowledge and understanding of the whole. For by what possibility could every individual clergyman become owner of the *Decretum* and the Decretals, the sixth book of the Decretals and the Clementines? The understanding of all this is so difficult, that hardly would a man of good abilities find it in his power to obtain a complete knowledge of the subject in three years. How can a pastor, occupied with looking after the spiritual welfare of the community entrusted to his care, find time for so tedious and exact a study, and make himself so familiar with those laws, that the decisions on every point should be ever present to his mind?[1] And yet this would be absolutely necessary for each individual, if he would avoid being entrapped in many things by Satan, and at length condemned as a transgressor. And while the parish priests are thus burdened, they on their own part burden the laymen, the communities, the heads of households, with extortions and human ordinances, devised for the purpose of gain; and deprive them of many of the liberties pertaining to divine worship. "And if one"—says he—"should act differently from what these ordinances require, he knows that he must incur the anger of God and his saints, or the anathema. They have enthralled the conscience of the people, declaring the transgression of their rules to be a mortal sin; for in these days they lay more stress on a failure to observe minutely the order of the liturgy, than on the sins of lying, of a sleepy indolence, or covetousness, or anything of the like nature; so that men now-a-days are more afraid to transgress one of these human ordinances than the commandments of God himself." "The more ordinances there are"—says he—"the more frequent are transgressions and the stronger the temptations to transgress. Neither do they consider how these multifa-

1 Quomodo curatus occupatus in operibus salutis in plebes commissas potest ipsas ita per longa et diligentissima studia incorporare et ipsas familiares sibi ita reddere, ut quaelibet puncta in iis contenta semper et ubique ad manum habeat et in promptu.

rious ordinances force the multitude to despise them and the commandments of the Lord at the same time; which arises from the fact that he whose mind is turned on *many things*, is so much the less fitted for *single* duties; and from the fact that such ordinances, since they relate to sensible and outward things, appear to the communities in a peculiarly clear light, and inspire in them reverence; while the commandments of God are spiritual, and God who ordains them is a being whom they cannot see. Such ordinances, therefore, owing to the constant presence of the lawgiver, make a greater impression on the multitude than the commandments of the invisible God. Then, again, these commandments appear to carnal men as every-day matters; while those human ordinances, being something new, make a stronger impression on the minds of the people. Again, men are fond of seeking their salvation in such sensible and corporeal things, which lie near their capacities; and lose sight of the Crucified, who alone is the salvation of souls. And they settle it fast in their consciences, that they can be justified by such visible things, though the spiritual love of Christ may be absent from their hearts." He seeks to show *how* this multitude of laws, and this externalization of religion, lead men away from Christ. "In these days"—he says—"Satan has done much to draw away Christians from Christ; for in these days men are ashamed even to mention Jesus the crucified, or him who was spit upon.[1] Nay, they abhor to hear such truths; and they vehemently censure and persecute the persons who *thus* confess Christ. And such things have already been introduced into the pulpit; so that those false prophets despise and persecute the men who confess Jesus who was crucified and spit upon, and say it is quite enough to pronounce such words *once* a-year;[2] and the same false prophets extol to the skies their stately ceremonies and their ordinances addressed to the eyes of the people, and pronounce anathema on every man who does not punctiliously observe them. Satan does all that lies in his power to bring it about that the memory of Jesus Christ should be obliterated

1 Idcirco hac via Satanas multum hodie profecit in Christianorum abductione, nam hodie jam Christiani horrent nominare Jesum crucifixum vel Jesum consputum vel suspensum in patibulo aut horrende occisum.

2 Et dicant, quod sufficit talia *semel* in anno nominare.

from the hearts of Christians." Appealing to the apostle Paul, he maintains, that many laws avail nothing "for man's unbridled wickedness, ever striving to exceed weight and measure, will not be kept in check by human laws and ordinances, when it always despises the laws of God; for it is continually breaking over the latter, and the more, with greater effort, greater pride and contempt, in proportion as it meets with obstacles to hinder it. Let not precepts and prohibitions, then, be multiplied in the church; for by means of them the devil has acquired a great power of involving the people in greater guilt; partly because, as has been said, he takes occasion from these ordinances to tempt them, and partly because these ordinances ensnare men's consciences, and make the sins of the unrighteous still heavier." He acknowledges that evil doers ought to be punished on account of their transgression of the commandments of the Lord, and ought to be restrained from the commission of sin, by terror; that those should be tamed and subdued by terror who still remain at a stage little superior to that of brutes, who have no understanding of that which is good.[1] But the righteous, they who are actuated by the Spirit of Jesus the crucified, stand in no need of multiplied human commands and prohibitions; because the Spirit of God guides and teaches them, and because they practise the virtues and obey the truths of God spontaneously and cheerfully, like a good tree, which brings forth good fruit of itself, God ever supplying the power from above;[2] because such made free by the indwelling Spirit of Christ, generally feel themselves cramped and confined by the multitude of ordinances, even in the performance of virtuous works. He illustrates this by the case of the Jews who would have prevented Jesus from healing the sick because it was the Sabbath day; also by the case of the Pharisees, who would have kept Christ from plucking the ears of corn on the Sabbath; and by the reply which he made to them

1 Iniqui tamen indigent poena vel vindicta pro suis peccatis et pro transgressione praeceptorum dominicorum; impediendi sunt a suis malis conatibus, vel in eorum prava voluntate per hujusmodi praecepta prohibitiva, quae parant viam justitiae ad vindictam exsequendam propter terrorem bestiarum, in quibus non est bonorum intellectus.

2 Si vero sunt justi et acti spiritu Jesu crucifixi, tunc hi non indigent mandatis et contradictionibus humanis plurificatis, tum quia docet eos et ducit spiritus dei, tum quia voluntarie et dulciter virtutes et veritates dei operantur, tanquam bona arbor per se fructus bonos producens, deo desuper dante.

(Matt. xii. 7). "No man"—says he—"can possibly invent laws suited to every contingency and relation; the Spirit of God alone can do this, who knows all things and holds them together; and inasmuch as this Spirit is present everywhere and to all men, the spirit of man also, which is in himself, which with the Spirit of Christ alone knows what is in man. The spirit of man, which is everywhere in men, which everywhere searcheth the man as such, has the knowledge of his powers and of his wants, this alone can give to each man befitting laws and establish them." He brings in illustration of this the ten commandments, which are plain to every one, even the dullest of understanding, so that no man can pretend that he is embarrassed by them; and Jesus the crucified, who is the power of God and the wisdom of God, has in a certain manner briefly summed them up in a single precept, requiring love to God and our neighbour; for love is the fulfilment of the law, and love is the perfect law of liberty. All other and multiplied laws of men—he says—are superfluous and inadequate. They ought not to be called traditions, but superstitions. No man can frame a law adapted to all times and places and circumstances, which is not contained in that one precept. To the class above-mentioned, he reckons the laws regulating fasts, seasons of prayer, the number of hymns which are to be sung, and the like. To them he ascribes frequent disquietude of conscience, which arose from the fear of having transgressed such laws. Confession to the priests served to illustrate the same thing, who made it much more a matter of conscience to have committed a mistake with regard to ecclesiastical hours, than to have transgressed any one of the laws of God. He wishes things might be so ordered that no other fear or punishment should ever be held up before subjects than in reference to the words of Jesus Christ and his commands. All other inventions of men should be regarded simply as counsels. At the same time, however, while he thus refers everything to the law of Christ as the only valid law, he defends himself against the objection, that by so doing he would overturn all human law, and says: "I have not been so presumptuous, I protest, as to attack the decrees and ordinances of the holy fathers and of the approved councils, who, actuated by the Holy Ghost, have so done and ordered all that has been done and ordered by them; but my attack is directed against those

who, instead of being inspired by the love of Christ, strive and have striven, under the impulse of their passions, to glorify themselves, and who take more delight in the glory of their *own* name, than in honouring the name of Jesus who was crucified." Thus human laws were to be recognized *only as such*, and the commandments of God to remain in their dignity, and as such to be reverenced and obeyed. This the faithful apostle of Christ, who might well serve as an example to all disciples, had wonderfully illustrated in himself: for Paul (in 1 Cor. vii.) distinguishes what he says in his own name from what he makes known as a precept of the Lord. "Mark"—says he—"with what discrimination and moderation he speaks to his flock, so as nowhere to impose a necessity and nowhere to inspire fear, except for the precepts and words of the Lord Jesus Christ." He places in contrast with this the form of the papal bull: Jubemus mandamus, etc. Following directly after this is a prophetic utterance: "I speak to all; let him who is capable of receiving it, receive it. So have I gathered from the Holy Scriptures, and I believe, *that all the above-named works of men, ordinances and ceremonies, will be utterly extirpated, cut up by the roots and cease; and God alone will be exalted, and his word will abide for ever; and the time is close at hand, when these ordinances shall be abolished.*"[1] In another place he says: "All rules are one: they proceed from one principle and aim at one end. They do not obtain their authority from themselves, nor are they observed in the church of God on their own account; but they are inseparably included in *the same* holy law of Christ, which is inscribed by the Holy Spirit on the hearts of believers, which binds many widely-separated nations in union with one another, and makes all dwell with *one* set of manners in the house of Jesus the crucified.[2] While the *one* commandment of Christ, and his *one* sacrifice preserved in the church, greatly promote unity, so on the other hand, the multitudinous prescriptions of men burden and disturb the collective body of the church of Christ." He is continually falling back

1 Et puto, quod omnia praenotata opera hominum, caerimoniae et traditiones funditus destruentur et cessabunt, et exaltabitur deus solus, et verbum ipsius manebit in aeternum, et tempus illud jam instat, in quo illa evacuabuntur.

2 Regulae omnes sunt unum et ex uno ad unum, non autem per se celebratae et auctoritatae in dei ecclesia, ut definitae seorsim, sed inclusae indivisibiliter in una eademque sancta lege et regula christiana a Christo Jesu tradita per spiritum sanctum in cordibus fidelium descripta.

on the principle, that unity among men can only come from the word of God; a forced uniformity would of necessity produce nothing but divisions. He endeavours also, in his own way, to establish this principle speculatively. God alone is the infallible and self-sufficient being, needing no rules from without to govern his conduct. His own will is his rule, and his wisdom is the immutable rule for that. This supreme rule is the Father himself; the Son of God is the rule for all creatures. This primal type and this rule is the Word of the Father; the Father worketh everything through him; and after the same analogy, the Holy Spirit is the beauty and the proportion of this rule, which nowise differs in essence from that primal type; hence the Holy Spirit and the Word are the only true rule for all that relates to man; hence, therefore, the Father is the shaping principle, from which all things proceed; the Son the shaping principle towards which all things aim; the Holy Ghost the principle in which all things repose; and yet there are not three rules or forms, but *one*. Hence he infers that the highest rule, by which everything is to be tried, is Christ, that single rule, which is alone necessary and alone sufficient for all apostles and every man that cometh into the world, in all matters, in every place, and at all times; not only for men, but also for angels, because he is himself that truth and wisdom which works mightily from one end of being to the other. God imparted to all essences a tendency and direction to their ultimate end, and in their just relation to that consists their perfection and the perfection of the universe. This is the inmost determining rule for each essence, but it is a thing not different from the essence of the object itself. The rule by which all things are governed, is a different matter. This, holy Scripture calls by various names, God's word, God's will, etc. Although this is the common rule for all, yet it is the rule preeminently for rational beings; because other beings cannot consciously apprehend it, nor freely appropriate it as their own.[1] Then he comes upon the idea of positive law, and says: "This has not been able to reform rational beings who have fallen from the truth inwardly inscribed on their hearts; but rather became

1 Quoniam omnes res aliae a rationalibus creaturis, quamvis ab hac veritate et secundum eam gubernantur pro sua natura vel forma, tamen eandem non cognoscunt, neque habent in suis operationibus electionem.

an occasion of still greater departures from order, and internal hardness through sin. Sin," he remarks, with allusion to the well known words of the apostle Paul, "became still more sin than it was before, from the very circumstance that it was now forbidden not only by the law within, but by another from without.[1] For the more men are provided with means of grace, the more knowledge they have, the greater in the same proportion is their guilt, when, on account of sin, these means and this knowledge are despised. God now finally determined to communicate to man his will in the most perfect manner, by teaching him, through the Holy Spirit, all truth in a living way;" and here he cites the words: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; and outwardly he set before him his will through the revelation of the incarnate Word; reminding man of his duty in a way the most cogent and the most effective, both from within, by the incarnate Word that dwells in us, and from without, by his divine works standing before our eyes; from within, by grace and love, from without, by the sacraments which contain and produce grace. This internal inscription of the truth upon the heart, includes in it the two preceding revelations of it (he means, without doubt, positive law and the law of conscience), and has vivified and reformed them."[2] After having spoken, as already before, of the simplicity of the ten commandments, and of the fact that these had been summed up in the one commandment of love, he observes that Jesus, who simplifies everything, had abolished the multitude of sacrifices and ceremonies, and substituted in their place the one heavenly sacrifice: this was so ordered for the purpose of preserving unity in the church. Even the apostles had subsequently imposed no new ordinances, or but very few, and they had given no other commandment than the love of God and of our neighbour, which last they had sought chiefly to commend, to impress, and to spread abroad among the nations. Hence Christ had left no written law for those who came after him, though he might, in various ways, have done so during his lifetime; but he only gave his good Spirit, the Spirit of the

1 Multo magis enim peccatum peccantis tunc erat, quam prius, quia jam deintus et foris peccatum prohibebatur.

2 Haec itaque veritatis inscriptio collegit in se ambas praecedentes, easque vivificavit et reformavit.

Father in the hearts of the faithful, as the alone living and perfect law, and the all-sufficient rule of life. So too the apostles had given but few laws, since they doubtless knew, that the law of the Holy Spirit sufficed, which teacheth all truth, always, everywhere, in the most internal and immediate way. This led him to explain himself on a matter which seemed to be at variance with these views, viz. the apostolical ordinances of the assembly at Jerusalem. We will cite this remarkable passage, which contains a great deal of good sense. "The apostles let themselves down to the weakness of the new converts from Judaism; and by so doing they softened, in some measure, the hostile tone of feeling entertained by the Jews towards the Christians; and they would show, thereby, their reverence for the ancient law, that the synagogue might not seem to be cast aside so all at once; for the ancient mother, who was now dead, should be buried in a respectful manner."[1] Having spoken next against the multiplying of laws, because of the difficulty which the laity must experience of knowing them all, he adds: "For this reason I have myself come to the settled conclusion that it would be a salutary thing, and calculated to restore peace and union to Christendom, to root up that whole plantation, and once more sum up the whole in that single precept, to bring back the Christian church to those sound and simple beginnings where it would be needful to retain but a few, and those *only* the apostolical laws. For I believe, before my Lord Jesus the crucified, that the law of the Holy Spirit, and the common fathers, the parish priests, the pope and the bishops, parochial clergy and their assistants, all these are sufficient for the right guidance of the communities, and that they are sufficient for each individual, sufficient to resolve every question, and to decide all matters before the judicial tribunals and the tribunal of conscience." From these principles he thinks it possible also to demonstrate that monastic orders are not needed for the governance of the church.

Though Matthias did not take any open stand against the hierarchical system, yet he appears nevertheless to have been a

1 Condescendentes infirmitati fratrum novitiorum ex Judaismo conversorum, et per hoc compescentes aliqualiter Christianorum injuriam, et propter reverentiam legis veteris, ne tam cito refutata videretur synagoga, quia mater antiquata, jam mortua cum reverentia deduceretur ad sepulcrum.

forerunner of Protestantism *in this*, that he everywhere holds distinctly up to view the immediate reference of the religious consciousness to Christ, and makes the *true* unity of the church to rest solely upon that foundation. But of the many passages relating to this point which might be cited, we will select only the following: "It is Jesus Christ himself, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit ever dwells in his church and in each, even most insignificant portion of it, holding together, sustaining and vitalizing the whole and all the parts, directly and from within giving growth outwardly to the whole and to each, even the most insignificant part. He is, therefore, himself the spirit and life of his church, his mystical body.[1] Jesus, the crucified, is the vine; and all the branches proceeding from him and abiding in him, have and ought to have respect to him alone,[2] and other foundation can no man lay than that is laid." This immediate reference of the religious consciousness to Christ being placed at the head, everything else must take its shaping accordingly; and we recognize here the germinal principle of a new spirit, destined to burst asunder the old forms under which the Christian spirit had been shackled and confined. He says, "all unity presupposes a reference to some principle."[3] But that which forms the unity of the church is the one God, one Lord, one Master, one religion, one law, one commandment.[4] "All Christians who possess the spirit of Jesus the crucified, and who are impelled by the same spirit, and who alone have not departed from their God, are the one church of Christ, his beautiful bride, his body; and they are not of this world, as Christ is not of this world, and therefore the world hates them." The unity that has proceeded from Christ he places in contrast with those antagonisms among

1 Jesus est solus, qui cum patre et sancto spiritu toti ecclesiae suae et cuilibet parti ejus et minutissimae semper assistens totum et quamlibet ipsius partem immediate atque intrinsece continet, sustentat et vivificat, dat incrementum toti et cuilibet et minimae parti ejus, quapropter ipse est spiritus et vita suae ecclesiae et sui corporis mystici.

2 Ad quam ipsum solum habent et debent habere totaliter suum respectum.

3 Universitas dicitur ab uno aliquo, ad quod omnia supposita universitatis habent ordinem et attributionem, et nisi sit tale unum principale, a quo reliqua omnia et tale quid, quod possit formare de multis universitatem et conservare, non unitas neque universitas, sed dispersa diversitas esset.

4 Illud vero tale unum, faciens unitatem ecclesiae est unus deus, unus dominus, unus magister, una religio, una lex, unum praeceptum.

men and nations that have grown out of their apostacy from God. "Difference creates the differences among nations and their mutual alienation from each other, just as, on the other hand, unity in the acknowledgment of one God contributes especially to bring about unity among nations." This, he observes, was a thing well understood by the ancient kings, and especially by the Romans, who—which is undoubtedly a mistake so far as it concerns the Romans—endeavoured to bring all the nations which they subdued, to the worship of one God such as they would have him to be. Idolatry—he says—and apostacy from the true God, is not now merely what it was in earlier periods, gross idolatry in the proper sense; but the setting up of an idol in the mind and the affections, and placing such an idol in the temple of the Holy Ghost: that is, to love the present world, and that which is in the world, just this is apostacy from God and idolatry. "Since"—he says—"it is already the day of light and of truth; since in Jesus Christ the supreme God has already come so near to men; nay, the greatest union has taken place, of God with men and of men with God, because it is no longer God afar off, but a God near at hand, dwelling even now, in the most intimate manner, in the souls that are worthy of him;[1] since God has already appeared on earth and walked with men, the very fact that Christians should suffer themselves to be engrossed by the cares of this world, that they should let their love and their imitation be directed to any other than Jesus Christ, the true God, or that they should make the home of their souls in this world rather than in the Lord their God, or that they should cling with their affections more to the world than to Christ, is plainly a falling away, an apostacy from God and a preference for idols in the spirit and temper of the soul, is already a separation from union with the body of Christ, and a becoming incorporated with the body of antichrist, of the god of this world." Considering the matter from this point of view, he is of the opinion, that what St Paul says of the apostacy of the last times, might already be applied to his own time. He says of his contemporaries: "They would attain

1 Quia jam est dies lucis et veritatis, propinquitas summi dei ad homines in Christo Jesu, imo unio maxima dei ad homines et hominum cum deo, quia jam factus est non deus de longinquo, sed deus de prope, imo deus jam intimo inhabitare animas dignas se.

to justification, and believe they can obtain it by many labours, with much expense, in the performance, even to satiety, of all the newly appointed ceremonies; and yet Christ is become to their hearts as one dead; they have nothing of his spirit, they see and know him not. Hence they perform all their isolated works according to the letter, and in a spirit of fear according to the law; but they know nothing of the true liberty, of the freedom which is in the spirit of Jesus Christ. Hence they appear to be little if at all different from the Scribes and Pharisees, among the ancient people of the Jews, on whom our Lord Jesus Christ often denounced wo; and the apostle Paul has often reproached such persons with apostatizing from the Christian faith. And all Holy Scripture, all Christian faith, proclaims, preaches, and confesses, that Jesus Christ the crucified alone is the one Saviour, and the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth; that he alone is all power, all wisdom for every Christian, he himself the alpha, the beginning and the end, and that every one who is longing and striving to be a just and virtuous man, must first of all and immediately put on Christ himself and his spirit, because he is himself the way, the truth, and the life. After him alone, first of all, and with the whole heart, we should seek; begin to glorify him and to carry him in our souls, who alone hath redeemed us at that great price, his precious blood." He charges it upon his contemporaries that when they separated faith from works in their mistaken search after self-righteousness, they substituted in place of the genuine Christian morality, a morality which they had learned in the schools of ancient philosophy. "Because they did not like to retain Christ crucified in their knowledge, the Son of God gave them over to a reprobate mind (Rom. i. 28), to expend their efforts in building up their own righteousness; and they think they shall be able to attain to a virtuous life after the methods of Aristotle, of Plato, and the other philosophers, by their own efforts and virtuous habits."[1] On the basis of these general views he forms his conception of the church in its true sense, as a community taking its outward form from a principle within itself, by its common reference to Christ; he

1 Ut cum magnis laboribus suorum studiorum velint suam justitiam statuere, et per omnia ad modum Aristotelis aut Platonis ceterorumque philosophorum se posse ad vitam virtuosam pervenire per studia propria et virtutes usuales.

styles the church the body of Christ, the community of the elect.[1] For as he makes the Augustinian system his point of departure, he everywhere gives special prominence to the antithesis of elect and non-elect. Placing that immediate reference of the religious consciousness to Christ at the head, he is forced, even though he leaves the entire hierarchical system untouched, still to admit those consequences, by which the hitherto separating wall between priests and laymen must be broken down, the idea of the universal priesthood revived, Christianity made to appear as a principle of purification from all that is of the world, the priestly character restored to the entire life, and the distinction of an inferior and a higher position in Christian life, the severance of the *consilia* and the *præcepta* done away with. "Every Christian"—says he—"is already an anointed man, and a priest;"—where he refers for proof to the well known passages of the New Testament relating to this point. Attacking from this position the over-valuation of the monastic orders and denying the spiritual superiority which they arrogated to themselves, he says, "there are many, standing in the opinion of the multitude at the very summit of holiness and of Christian religion, who reply to those inquiring after the shortest way to salvation, that there is no other except to serve Christ after a perfect manner in this or that order; so certain is it to every one, that a person belonging to such an order is seldom or never condemned, and that he who enters such an order is as speedily delivered from all punishment and guilt, as if he were born anew of water and the Spirit. He who questions this, exposes himself to an irreconcilable war." He vigorously attacks this opinion, the supposed opposition between spirituals and seculars. "It is evident, that to style Christians the *world* and *seculars* is a calumnious misrepresentation." He cites the words of Christ, "That which is born of the Spirit, is spirit." "One of the greatest trials that Christ's chosen can meet with is this, that when a Christian, whatever he may be, man or woman, virgin or widow, is heartily inclined to do penance for his or her sins, and to serve Jesus Christ in an

1 Ecclesia electorum est unicum proprie et solum corpus mysticum Christi Jesu. Words of Janow from the work already cited in the fragment published under the name of Huss, cap. 10, fol. 370, p. 2. A similar passage is also found in the work which has not as yet been published: Ecclesia electorum, quae proprie et solum est corpus mysticum Christi.

orderly manner, if such a person lives in the midst of the Christian community, and thus consecrates his life to Christ with a view to live more perfectly in the simplicity of the spirit, and for suitable reasons does not enter one of those monastic orders, he must at once suffer persecution from them and from his own associates, must be looked upon as a heretic, and be called by the vulgar a Beghard, a Beguine, a Turlepinus, or by some such reproachful epithet. Such an one must be called up and put on trial, to determine whether he is a heretic." From this and similar utterances of Matthias we find, what is confirmed also by other indications in the history of these times, that those who distinguished themselves among the laity by a more earnest and strict piety than common, and more especially societies composed of such persons, were very sure to be objects of jealousy, to be stigmatized as heretical, and persecuted by the monastic orders; while on the other hand they were derided and treated with abuse by the common nominal Christians. Beghards was a nickname applied in the same way at that time as Pietists at a later period, by an ambitious clergy, zealots for the letter of orthodoxy, and by the vulgar people of the world. After this, Matthias of Janow says, "Wherefore the men of Christ, who live in the midst of our present Christians, must either enter into some monastic order, or else do their works of charity only in secret." In a passage where he places the laity on a par with ecclesiastics as to their title to daily or frequent communion, of which we shall speak more particularly hereafter, he says: "Although the priest or minister of the church has precedence over the holy laity in this, that it belongs to him to offer, to consecrate, and to distribute the body of Christ, yet they are equals as it regards the enjoyment of the holy supper; and although the priest has a nobler and more eminent vocation in the church than any layman, yet every layman who in a right and holy manner fulfils his calling or his service in the church, is alike useful to the priest and to the church, because at his own proper position, a position quite as necessary for Christ's body, he serves Christ in his vocation, and therefore earns from him his daily bread, if he does but live just as uprightly and faithfully to the Lord Jesus, and as long as he perseveres, as he should do, in the vocation to which God has called him. As the priest singing,

praying, and administering the sacraments, thereby serves our common Lord Jesus Christ, and is therein useful to the church; so the peasant in ploughing, and pasturing his cattle, as long as he stands fast in the common love, serves the Lord Jesus Christ, and is necessary and useful to his family or to the holy church. The same holds good of other laymen, such as tradesmen and artisans in civil society.[1] For as it would fare ill with the church of God to be without priests or soldiers, so neither could she dispense with, or even subsist without, peasants and men of other occupations. As the manner of calling and the works of the former are necessary, so too are the various callings and works of the latter. And as the calling of the former and its exercise comes to them from Jesus Christ, so the various callings and employments of the latter have come from God and Christ; the calling of the latter indeed is more primitive and more indispensable than that of the former, since the occupation and practice of husbandry and of the other trades existed earlier than that of the priest. Countrymen and soldiers do not exist for the sake of priests, but priests for the sake of the peasantry and the soldiers." He endeavours to show, that the term saint is to be applied to every Christian, whose life answers to his name, although there are different degrees in the application of this name, as there are in progressive sanctification. "The term Christian"—he remarks —" denotes a man sanctified by baptism, which by another name is called unction; hence the Christian is one anointed. So one is called a saint in virtue of that sanctifying grace,[2] which is realized by a meritorious life and the virtues. This sanctifying grace, however, and the first baptismal grace are substantially the same; the only difference being that sanctifying grace consists in the good use of that first grace.[3] And thus every Chris-

1 Sicut sacerdos psallens et orans atque sacramenta administrans per hoc servit communi domino Jesu Christo, et in eo est utilis ecclesiae, ita rusticus arando et sua pecora pascendo manens in communi caritate similiter in eo ipso optime servit Jesu Christo, et est utilis et necessarius ipsius familiae vel ecclesiae sacrosanctae, et ita de aliis singulis laicis mechanicis in republica.

2 The gratia gratum faciens.

3 Nec differt in alio, nisi quod gratia gratum faciens est bonus usus gratiae gratis datae seu gratiae primae. When St Paul says: "By grace I am what I am," he makes this refer to that objective grace which may be used in different ways according to the different bent of the will the gratia gratis data; but when St Paul says: "and this grace was in me not in vain," he makes this refer to grace in the second, subjective sense.

tian, so far as he is such, is a saint; since he has been sanctified by the first baptismal grace; just as every saint must, by reason of his holy walk and virtues, be a true Christian. All who have been sanctified, have been sanctified by the anointing of grace and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus; and hence it follows, that every Christian is a saint and every saint a Christian; and, as one cannot have the use of grace without its habit, so one cannot be a Christian and at the same time not a saint. Do not object to me the bad Christians, who have lost the first grace by reason of their misuse of it; for these are not Christians—save as the term is improperly understood—any more than the painted figure of a man is a man. But if you object that the baptismal sign and the *fides informis* are to be found even in bad Christians, and that this is enough to entitle one to the name of Christian, I answer, that the mere sign, if the grace be not present, is not enough either to make one a Christian or to entitle one to the name of Christian;" where he introduces the following comparison: "A hoop hung out before a house (this in Bohemia must have been the sign of an inn) still does not make the place an inn, if there is no wine in the house." Those, he supposes, who merely made profession of Christianity, with whom it was no more than an outward mask, their lives testifying against their profession, deserved rather to be called antichristians than Christians. But though every Christian is a saint, every Christian is not equally so; but there are different degrees of holiness among a Christian people. "While man remains in the present life, the way of progress in holy living is ever open before him, this entire life being either a progression or a retrogression." He attacks here those mystical Beghards, condemned in the year 1311 at the council of Vienne, who held that man may in the present life reach the stage of perfection, that he may become absolutely sinless, so as to be incapable of further progress in grace; arguing that if continual progress were possible, one might become more perfect than Christ. Now he supposes that though degrees of progressive development infinitely different are conceivable, yet the fathers have distinguished three principal stages; that of beginners, that of the progressive, and that of the perfect; or the married, widows, and virgins. He rebukes the pride of the clergy. Did a man offend a clergyman, the bolt of excommunication was

pointed at him forthwith; but did *he* injure a layman, the wrong doer escaped with impunity. "By the just judgment of God we are"—says he—"fallen like Lucifer." In the contempt poured upon the clergy, that is, he recognizes a merited divine judgment. So in animadverting upon the false distinction of spirituals and seculars, and hierarchical self-conceit, while he gives distinct prominence to that fellowship of the community of saints which excludes every selfish feeling, he remarks: This union cannot be restored, unless those are first excluded who are sunk in self-love, and in place of them the number of those is multiplied who are zealous for that union of the church, and which is still more, who serve the cause of Christ rather than their own interests. He points not only at such as sought their own advantage in earthly things, but at those too, who in the spiritual life made their own interest alone the end, far removed from that love to common christendom, consisting of the perfect and the imperfect, the righteous and the weak. They, he says, who begin with despising the common manners of their fellow-Christians, who begin with extolling in particular their own societies and brotherhoods, as compared with others, mar by this course the unity of the Christian church and disturb Christian peace. They begin by thinking highly of themselves and would exalt themselves above the common mass of Christians, hold themselves to be the only spirituals and apostolicals, and call the great mass of other Christians Babylon and the world; they pretend that they alone fulfil the counsels of Christ, that the people neither can attain nor ought to attain the same perfection. Nor is it necessary to salvation; they are only bound to it by their vows. Thus from the position which he uniformly maintains, the great principle of the oneness of the Christian life, Matthias of Janow carries on his attacks against the false distinction of clericals and seculars, and at the same time against a distinction grounded upon the same views, which had stood good for so many centuries, and had been adopted by the scholastic theology into the concatenation of its system, whereby it was more firmly established, the distinction of *consilia* and *præcepta*. After the words above cited he remarks, "applying all this to themselves alone and excluding the people, they set up themselves as objects of the greatest veneration, thereby promoting in the rest of the

people great freedom of the flesh, the relaxation of all Christian discipline, and great self-deception on the part of the simple, who plead in excuse of themselves, we are worldly people, living in the flesh; we may be permitted to have this or that." And if there happen to be in Christian communities persons who seek to reach, according to their measure, evangelical perfection in their mode of life, as poverty, chastity, obedience to their spiritual superiors, the other ordinary Christians will soon persecute them. He illustrates this by the same facts which we have noticed already, that the monks from jealousy persecuted such persons under the name of Beghards and Beguines, telling them that if they wanted to lead a life of that sort they should become monks. What have you to do with the world? What have you in common with the people of the world? "Hence it comes about that among the common laity no pious people are to be found." He complains that those who were devout among the laity were suspected; and yet they were best qualified by word and example to advance and confirm the progress of others. And since such saints were the people's neighbours, were regarded by them as equals with whom they associated in the daily business of life, they might easily provoke imitation in every thing; which could not happen in the case of the monks, who stood so far apart from the people in their calling, and in their modes and habits of life.[1] The conduct of these devout people being looked upon by the others with suspicion, carnal and lukewarm Christians were led to cherish the delusion, that it was well with them; in spite of their worldly and lukewarm affections they still thought themselves sure of salvation, observing that all who sought to live godly lives among the Christian people were despised by the monks. They were flattered in this their delusion by citations from Scripture, falsely interpreted. He gives the following as an example: "There is no better thing than to lead a moderate life, and not to differ too much from the rest of the world; for no men are worse than those who would be righteous overmuch."

1 Et quia per id, quod sunt tales sancti, vulgo intimo propinqui pares in vita et commixti in contubernio, imitabiles faciliter in omnibus, quae nequaquam sunt vel possunt esse in monachis et religiosis, qui extant nimis longinqui in vita sua et professione a plebibus.

With this zeal in maintaining the universal priesthood of the faithful, the equality of Christian worth and dignity in all orders and professions, Matthias united the deepest interest in another object, one which then formed a weighty point of controversy between the different parties concerned, the question relating to the frequent or daily communion of laymen. While in the seventeenth century, in the Catholic church of France, it was thought an indication of greater Christian seriousness, greater zeal for true conversion, to invite laymen to abstain for a while from the communion, in order to prepare themselves for the more worthy participation of it, and avoid the mistake of using it as an *opus operatum*, the case seems to have been exactly reversed in the period of which we are speaking. The party who were most zealous to awaken the laity and promote their Christian advancement, of whom Matthias of Janow may be considered a representative, were urgent for inviting the laity to this frequent participation, inasmuch as this sacrament was the best means for promoting Christian growth, for exciting and strengthening faith: but the opposite party feared lest the laity should be put on a level with the clergy. Matthias of Janow took the liveliest interest in this controversy. He was ever falling back upon it, and indeed wrote a paper on the subject, which is incorporated in the greater work already mentioned. The stamp of his whole peculiar Christian bent is impressed upon these polemical transactions; and it deserves to be noticed that he uniformly expresses himself as if he thought the laity also were entitled to partake of the communion in both kinds. Many of the arguments which he adduces, admit of being equally applied to show that the laity may partake of the cup as well as of the bread, and ought not, in this respect, to be placed lower than the clergy; and we cannot doubt, that the recognition of the equal right of the laity in this matter also, lay at the bottom, as he everywhere tacitly assumes it. "It is"—says he—"doing God and Christ the greatest wrong, for one to deny himself or others the frequent partaking of the body of Christ." He assumes that God, who in the highest sense belongs to all, and is in the highest sense good, and incapable of any respect to persons, must take delight in all who are willing to receive him.[1]

[1] Quia deus summe communis et summe bonus sine acceptatione personarum, in omnibus, qui eum suscipiunt, vult delectari.

He cites the passages, where Christ invites men to his fellowship. He appeals to the analogy of the Old Testament, to the daily sacrifice, which corresponded to the Lord's supper;[1] here, too, were bread and wine, just as both must be together in the holy supper.[2] He complains that, in his time, this daily sacrifice had ceased, as the vain people had generally, or for the most part, forsaken the daily or frequent enjoyment of the supper, and approached it but once, or hardly *once* in a year; and then, in the case of many, it was done not from devotion, but only from hypocrisy, or a sort of constraint, which each laid on himself; and it was already looked upon as an abuse, to be always participating in the Lord's supper. There had arisen a Judaizing set, who tried to dissuade the people from the practice of daily communion. He declaims against priests so destitute of all love towards the Christian people,[3] who cruelly kept away the hungry and thirsty flock from provisions which were their own,[4] and who set themselves to oppose others who took delight in feeding the poor. He reminds his opponents of Gamaliel's language in the Acts of the Apostles. The effects of frequent communion among the laity were appealed to in defence of the practice and as a proof that the thing was of God. In those priests who exhorted the people to frequent communion, he sees true Christian love; and speaks of their animating influence on the laity. Desire for the frequent enjoyment of the communion, he said, was on the increase among the laity; and it would continue to rise higher in proportion to the fervency of devotion among the Christian people. We here meet with a remark relating to the incipient renovation of the religious life, which deserves notice. "It is already well known"—he says—"that the spirit of devotion and the glow of charity is reviving among the communities, and the words of our sermons rise to life again, because the Spirit of Jesus works in them." He repels the insinuation, that the celebration of mass, in which all partook *spiritually*, the *spiritual*

1 The juge sacrificium.

2 Propter quotidianam frequentiam et propter *dualitatem utriusque speciei*, panis et vini, a quibus hoc sacrificium integratur. Here we may perceive that the necessity of the two kinds is expressly assumed.

3 Impii, qui refugiunt, cum plebibus laborare, sine foedere, sine pia ad populum affectione.

4 Plebejis esurientibus et sitientibus suum cibum et potum crudeliter denegant.

participation of the Lord's supper *in faith*, is enough. It might suffice for an angel, but not for men, composed of soul and body. If that were true, there was no need of the incarnation of the Son of God, and the institution of the holy supper itself would be superfluous. He who voluntarily deprives himself of the bodily enjoyment of the holy supper, deserves also to be deprived of the spiritual enjoyment of it. "For"—says he—"the experience of every year teaches, that they who come to the communion but once a year, or but seldom, do for the most part fail also to participate in the *res sacramenti;* for such persons come to the ordinance in the spirit of bondage, and remain strangers to the holy joy, the sober bliss of the spirit of Christ."[1] They show it by this, that they look forward to that day and that hour in a spirit of slavish fear, instead of hailing it with joy. They are only driven to the observance by the custom of their church, and the prescription of their teachers; and they rejoice when the season is over, and do not wish for its return, thinking they are now free to live as they list. They who esteemed themselves unworthy, and abstained from the communion through humility, should be encouraged the more; because they truly humbled themselves, they were worthy of being exalted by God. Christ came to bring down the lofty, and lift up the lowly. He thinks that as worldly priests cared nothing for the laity, and never invited them to the frequent enjoyment of the holy supper, it would be no rashness in the latter to demand the enjoyment of this bread which was meant for them. He refers to Christ's words: He that is not *with* me, is *against* me; he that *gathereth* not with me, scattereth abroad. But that man is not with Jesus, who, though bound to do so, yet neglects to provide for the salvation of those souls that seemed placed in his way. Was it objected, that the dignity of the priests would suffer by so doing, he would answer: "The man who speaks thus plainly evinces that he is a man actuated by a zeal that is without knowledge, for he censures as an impropriety, what he would certainly wish to take place if he were animated by the good Spirit of God." He appeals to the words of Moses, who wished that all might be

1 Accedunt enim timore servili, et in nullo tales gustant spirituale gaudium vel aliquid dulcedinis spiritus Jesu.

prophets. But these, filled with the spirit of envy, would be lords. When they complained of the zeal of the laity to enjoy frequent communion, they resembled the Jews who said, "Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? behold, the world has gone after him!" (John xii. 19). He affirms that many of the laity were not inferior in virtue, in meritorious works, in love of the sacraments, to the priests; it was here also true that soldiers, harlots, and publicans went into the kingdom of heaven before the Scribes and Pharisees. Though laymen should partake daily of the Lord's supper, yet they would not for this reason be placed on a level with the priests; for the laity would still be the people, and the priests would, by virtue of their calling, still be set over them. If, they said, The priests would be less reverenced, the direct *contrary* would prove to be the fact, because the people in the case supposed would be more attached to their priests, would cling to them more closely as they received from them *greater* benefits and more frequently, as the sheep cluster around their shepherds from whom they receive their food; so because the priests would be compelled to labour more for their communities, to hear their confessions, and to bestow on them the sacrament, whence would naturally spring up greater love and gratitude towards them; and because this love in them would be renewed, the Lord being in the midst of those gathered together in his name, he who produces in the hearts of subjects the obedience due to their superiors; and because it is the first and most excellent fruit of this sacrament to bind the church (which is Christ's body) and its members, each in its own place, with Christ. Such was the power of this sacrament to make the multitude of the people *one*. It was now objected that the case of priests differed from that of laymen; because priests were, by their office, obliged continually to hold mass; hence they were the more excusable if they were not always prepared to partake worthily of the supper. To this he replies: they sinned not the less, but far more by their unworthy participation, because the character, the position and calling of unworthy priests, were a great grievance. He attacks those famous men who had taught in their writings that women in particular ought to be discouraged from frequent communion; he opposes to them the Christian principle that all such distinctions are annulled in the new creation; as it is said, One Father,

one Spirit, one faith, one Lord, one baptism for all. Weakness was no reason for such exclusion; for God had chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty. He next speaks against the prohibition put forth probably in the year 1389, by the synod of Prague, against the frequent communion of the laity; and remarks: "Those modern hypocrites, doctors, and prelates, who live without God, know not what they are about, and what sort of an ordinance the continual sacrifice of the Lord in the church is." It was so called, not because the priests continually celebrated and enjoyed it, but because the holy church offers and enjoys it in common. He appeals to Christ's words, which are addressed to all: Take and eat. He retorts the objection drawn from the words of the Apostle Paul respecting unworthy participation. The apostle does not discourage Christians *generally* from daily partaking of the holy supper, but the unworthy, that they might make themselves worthy of it, and take more pains to sanctify themselves for it. He admonishes them; he does not dissuade, but teaches in what way they ought to present and enjoy this sacrament.

On this subject Matthias of Janow composed an express treatise in the form of a letter. He explains why he complied with his friend's invitation that he should write something on the matter in question. "For"—says he—"I bethink me thou must be concerned for the welfare of thy neighbours, and especially of the common people, since thou art desirous they should all be more often united to Christ by partaking of his precious body and blood; which certainly must come from thy good heart through the working of the Holy Spirit; for I was also incited to write something on this subject by the false zeal of some." He then mentions the various motives and reasons which influenced those who opposed the daily communion of the laity. "Some"—he says—"carry an outward show of zeal for the Lord, yet not with knowledge; and they pretend that they would thereby preserve the reverence which is due to the sacrament." "These"—he says—"entertaining too carnal views of the sacrament, fear where there is no reason for fear, lest our Lord Jesus should suffer anew, in this sacrament, some violence, or contempt, or injury; whereas our Lord having once died, death hath no more power over him in any way; for, in giving his now spiritual body, which

is no longer capable of suffering, to the whole world and to each individual, richly to enjoy, he nevertheless suffers no change in himself. They evince their sympathy with the Lord Jesus too foolishly in this, that they are so hard towards their neighbours. They are cruel towards the members of Christ. Those foolish and unfaithful servants, who are set over but a few things, are friends to those who lead bad lives, and by their bad lives every day throw contempt on the sacrament, and they favour their party. Others fear to extend this sacrament to the people, lest they should hazard the safety of their own souls." Christ, however, had presented the sacrament to the unworthy Judas, and the church had never decreed that any not unworthy could be kept back from the enjoyment of the holy supper. He argues, on the other hand, that even though the laity should partake of the communion but once a year, there might still be many among them unworthy. Others—says he—do not enter upon any such arguments, but contend only from love of strife and the heat of passion, against the frequent communion of the laity. He next mentions those who proudly despised the poor among the people, and were afraid that by frequent communion they would be put too much on a level with themselves.[1] He quotes some of their characteristic language: "Those Beghards and Beguins are striving hard to put themselves on a level with the priests." He says of them: "They desire not to know that to all Christ's faithful it has been said, Ye are a royal priesthood;" and he brings up the passages referring to this point in the Apocalypse. In attacking the wall of separation erected by the hierarchy between clergy and laity, and bringing distinctly up to notice the work of the Holy Spirit among laymen, he does not forget to apply the same principles of reasoning also to the female sex. He notices the fact that, in his time, there were women of distinguished piety, whose lives presented a strong contrast to the corrupt world. "As before"—he says—"in comparing laymen with monks and priests, it was remarked that our Lord having rejected the wise of this world on account of their pride and hypocrisy, would the more abundantly reveal his salvation to the little ones among the people; so, in comparing men and women, something

1 Hi sunt, qui ferme quemlibet de plebe dedignantur, bestias et Ribaldos pauperes plebeios audaciter nuncupando.

similar might be said with regard to the recipiency of the latter for the gifts of Christ. Whereas men commonly, at the present time, conscious of their natural gifts, do not know how to humble themselves and to bear the reproach of Christ; or if they have the advantage in some gifts of grace, directly ascribe it, in their self-complacency, to efforts of their own, and so do not prove loyal to the Lord Jesus Christ; therefore God and Jesus Christ, forsaking such men, transfers his treasures to women; for he has chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty (1 Cor. i. 27). And hence women are to be found in these times, virgins and widows, who zealously do penance, hasten to the holy sacraments, and take the kingdom of God before the men, who are occupied with the vanities of this world. Hence we may observe, how the ordinary women fill the churches at prayers, occupy the seats at sermons, present themselves before the priests for confession, seem to be full of sobs and tears, receive daily, in constant devotion and with joy, the holy supper, forsake the pomp of the world together with its pleasures, are ever abounding in love to Christ, ever thinking on the cause of the Lord, and joyfully and thankfully receiving manifestations and visions of the Lord. Thus the women are a hundred fold more rich in spiritual blessings, in these times, than the men." He then refers to the examples of Hildegard, of Brigitt in Sweden, and of many other women whom he had known in Paris, Rome, and Nuremberg,[1] and of still more in Prague; "and how I admired the Lord Jesus in his works."[2] "They"—says he—"who admire the rich men of this world because they can gain a good deal out of them, are priests to whose eyes the mighty monarch of this world appears as one to be feared and reverenced, even though he be a man of crime, but who abuse and despise them that fear God. When a rich man comes to such, and asks them to hear his confession, or to offer him the sacraments, O how readily and cheerfully do they bestow them on him. But when the poor of the flock beg them to hear their confessions and give them the communion, they do it with difficulty and after long delay, and as if they were

1 We are here reminded that Nuremberg was a seat of the Friends of God, and of Margaret Ebnerin and her connection with Henry of Nördlingen. Vid. Hermanni Opuscula pag. 331 sq. Perhaps there was some connection between the Friends of God in this district and the Friends of reform in Bohemia.

2 See Jordan, Vörlaufer des Hussitenthums in Böhmen. S. 62.

tired of the business; but if they demand the sacraments of the church repeatedly, these men begin to mutter that they give them the headache, or to complain that they take up too much of their time, and finally the poor are repelled away, not without signs of impatience." He maintains that "every Christian to whom the frequent or daily *spiritual* participation of the body of Christ is granted, will also be in a suitable frame for the frequent or daily enjoyment of the communion, because he who is worthy of that which is granted only to the holy, is also worthy of that which is granted alike to the bad and the good. This *spiritual* participation through devotion and faith, is a thing which God alone produces in man; as Christ himself says: It is the spirit that maketh alive, the flesh profiteth nothing. But in the distribution of the holy supper, which serves to the increase of grace in those who worthily partake, the minister of the church is the co-operating agent." Again: "What the Holy Ghost has wrought in a human soul, no man should destroy. But the fervour of devotion is what the Holy Ghost has wrought, and hence the hungering and thirsting after the frequent enjoyment of the Lord's supper. For assuredly this thirsting after the sacrament, which arises from the devotion of faith, is itself a work of the Holy Ghost," and he cites the words of Christ in which he invites every one that thirsteth to himself. "This thirsting"—he observes—"is certainly one way in which the Father draweth to the Son. This work of the Holy Ghost, this drawing of the Father to the Son, is what he would destroy who presumes in any way whatever to forbid it." Referring to the words of St Peter in Acts x. 47, he finely remarks: "Who will dare refuse the bodily sacrament to those, on whom the spiritual grace has been bestowed by God himself? Hence it follows, certainly, that every Christian who has that faith in Christ, which works by love, may often worthily receive the body of Christ; every one who believingly attends mass, and who devoutly, with heart and lips, confesses himself a sinner, is worthy of it, and it is for his benefit that he should partake at the mass of the body of Christ." But few, and those notorious sinners, should be excluded from the communion; as for example, adulterers, harlots, usurers. But such persons when excluded should be publicly named; so that the faithful may understand that no

fellowship is to be had with such in the sacraments, and avoid the contagions of their bad example. They too who give public scandal by their vices ought on every Sunday to be publicly and solemnly named, and debarred from the sacraments.[1] He places in the same class such as go indecently or too extravagantly dressed, which is an evident mark of pride, so that no reasonable ground of excuse can be offered for it. He refers to an ordinance relating to this matter put forth by the archbishop of Prague,[2] and to another by Pope Urban VI., the promulgation of which had been witnessed by himself during his residence in Italy.[3] He affirms that beginners and those moving forward in the Christian life stand in more need of the sacraments than the perfect, for instance the saints in bliss. He compares the communication of Christ in the holy supper with milk offered to babes. Thus the incarnate Word lets himself down to man's wants and weaknesses, mystically communicating himself to them under the outward forms of bread and wine.[4] Thus it happens that the believer, who partakes only of bread and wine, and, by this act in itself considered, experiences no spiritual enjoyment, but is brought in contact with the forms of bread and wine only with his senses, cannot fail by earnest striving to attain to such a frame as to imbibe the sweet spirit of devotion into his inmost soul, and to taste and see how good the Lord is;[5] and thus he is nourished and strengthened and refreshed in spirit. This is, for

1 Quales sunt, qui deportant calceos rostratos in pedibus, aurum et argentum robis, cornuti in pedibus in barbis et omnes induti veste bottata et peregrina.

2 Jam nostris temporibus archiepiscopus Pragensis Johannes publice excommunicari praecepit hujusmodi filios Belial, qui defendebant rostra in calceis et cornutas vestes et impudicas; nam tempore, quo scribo, coram Jesu sum testis illius, et stabam ante foras templi, vetans tales anathemate percussos divinis officiis interesse.

3 See above, page 261.

4 Corpus domini et sanguis est lac datum pueris, ut sugerent, lac de petra oleumque de saxo durissimo, quia verbum caro factum est, ut homo sic panem angelorum manducaret, sicque digessit verbum caro factum, et miro modo composuit in eucharistia, ut essent manna absconditum et omnis multitudo dulcedinis sacramento sub speciebus panis et vini abscondita, quemadmodum lac puero matris ejus celatum est in mamillis, et veluti puer nullum vestigium lactis videns suis oculis, laboriose sugens ubero, in intimis suis dulcedinem percipit, quandoque pascitur et valde delectatur.

5 Ita prorsus quilibet fidelis nulla suavitate speciem Jesu ab eo in hoc sacramento percipiens, sed solum species panis et vini sensibus suis tractans, tum per conatus et laborem interioris hominis sugit hunc devotionis spiritum suavem in medullis suae animae, et degustat, quam suavis est dominus.

mankind, a rock; a rock of refreshment for him to whom it has been given to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock: a flinty rock to carnal minded men, who perceive not, in this venerable sacrament, the things of the Spirit of God; "and for this reason they lightly esteem it, and take no pains to secure the frequent enjoyment of it; they make no haste to this holy supper." It is the flintiest rock to the Jews and the Greeks, to him who believes not, and says, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? (John vi.). "But to us, who are in Christ Jesus, and believe God, and in him have tasted the good word of the Lord, to us it is sweet indeed as the mother's nourishing breast." The laity were often more worthy by reason of their free spontaneous longing, than mere priests by vocation. The faithful, god-worthy longing of such laymen was evidenced by this, that nothing could keep them back; they forsook everything in this world, their homes, their yokes of oxen,[1] their wives. "All that was gain to them, they counted as loss, that they might so win Christ, by often and gladly partaking of his body and blood." He goes on to describe the longing of these pious laymen, and to show what sacrifices they made to satisfy it. "They demand it humbly of their priests if it can be done; and, if refused, they press them with still more importunity, begging, adjuring them, and requiring it of them till they grow tiresome. And when they find themselves repulsed in every way by the inferior clergy, from ignorance, negligence or pride, they apply next to priests of a higher degree, to the bishops and their officials, and never cease, timid as they may be, unpleasant as they may find the duty, to urge and entreat, that they would procure for them a more frequent presentation of the Lord." He affirms that no unworthiness of the Christian, if he be but conscious of it, and make confession of it, can unfit him for the frequent or daily enjoyment of the communion. The contrary rather holds good. If a person deems himself worthy or holy, and boasts of being so, this makes the Christian unworthy; for it is pride and the worst kind of hypocrisy.[2] Any Christian who in this present

1 Doubtless with allusion to the excuses offered in the parable of the marriage supper.

2 Est hic advertendum, quod omnis indignitas in Christiano allegabilis undecunque, si est cognita et confessa in veritate, non facit eum indignum quotidiana vel

life held himself to be worthy of the daily communion, and professed as much of himself, whatever position that Christian might hold, and however much he might surpass others in virtue, and who looked upon others as unworthy, that man was alone and especially unworthy. The holy supper appears to him to be the highest act of worship, one with which nothing else was to be compared; and if it was objected that yet the celebration of the high festivals consisted in song and prayer, and the grand and imposing variety of holy ceremonies; he replied, Still all this was not to be compared with the act of partaking of the festival of the Lord in spirit and in truth. All this, says he, song, prayer, preaching, is but a preparation for the festival, and a certain participation in the fellowship with Christ; but after all it was not the true and spiritual festival of Christ, for it was not the bread that came down from heaven. He says: "Nominal Christians, worldly Christians, those of a carnal mind, who have not the spirit of Christ, never partake freely, with great desire and thankful heart, of the body of Christ; but, as often as they come to the sacrament, it is done with constraint, through the force of a custom observed from childhood, or from slavish fear." He compares the way in which the Christian assimilates this spiritual food and takes it up into his being, with the assimilating process in the case of natural food. "The sinner"—he says—"is at the first unlike Jesus Christ; but, by degrees, faster or slower, the life and spirit of the sinful man become transformed into the spirit and life of Jesus Christ, and pass into the most intimate union with him, no longer to be separated by any human power." He cites a remark from St Augustin, where the latter represents Christ as saying, in relation to the holy supper, It is not thou who art to transform me into thyself, as the food for thy body, but thou art to be transformed into me. "And this is pre-eminently the way in which God is glorified, and wonderfully appears in his saints, that that Word, from whom all things have sprung, *in* whom and *by* whom are all things,—of whom it is said, that he shall at last be all in all,—does in this way draw back again and

crebra communione, sed magis e contrario: omnis dignitas moralis credita vel confessa de se ipso dignitas vel sanctitas, illa nimis facit indignum Christianum, quia est superbia et hypocrisis pessima, coeca et mendosa.

transform all things into himself."[1] He then complains that the holy supper should in his own days be so commonly neglected among Christians, that they no longer earnestly endeavoured to have their spirit transformed into the life and spirit of Christ, but rather hindered it. It seemed to be their great end and aim to have a comfortable and quiet life in the world. They did not strive to be transformed into Christ, but longed and laboured, as much as in them lay, that Christ should be transformed into themselves: they sought not to become like to Jesus Christ, but desired rather that Jesus Christ should be like to themselves:[2] which was the greatest imaginable wrong, the very sin of Lucifer. It was a thing unworthy of this glorious sacrament, to think of compelling men to partake of it. This never should be done except in the case of those weak Christians who ventured not to come. He blames those that advised people of a wicked life to keep away from the sacrament; for it could in nowise profit them to persevere in their wicked life, and, for this reason, continue to be strangers to the remedy which was the safest for them. Such unworthy persons therefore should rather be advised to leave off their wicked life, and in company with the saints go frequently to the Lord's festival. He declares his disagreement with the advice commonly given that every man should examine himself, and, if he found himself unworthy, abstain from the Lord's supper. In opposition to this, he cites the words of St Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 28, and lays emphasis on the phrase, Let a man examine himself and *so let him eat*,—not, and so let him *abstain*. He seems also to infer from these words, that this self-examination was to serve only as a preparation to enable one worthily to partake of the holy supper. He notices another objection: It suffices to receive the holy sacrament but once; for at this one time we receive all. To this he replies: God has given it to his Son alone, to have life in him-

1 Quod illud verbum, ex quo omnia, in quo omnia et per quod omnia, quod ultimo dicitur esse omnia in omnibus, tali modo et via in se ipsum iterum convertit et digerit omnia.

2 Nec satagunt, digne vitam suam carnalem et spiritum suum vacuum et inanem converti in vitam et spiritum Jesu Christi, quinimo impediunt, quia de facto ad hoc se ponunt, ut bonam vitam, seu delicatam et quietam habeant in hoc mundo. Non laborant in Christum commutari, sed cupiunt et quantum in se est, faciunt, Christum in se ipsos converti, non desiderant esse Christi Jesu similes, sed Christum Jesum cupiunt esse similem sibi ipsis.

self so as never to be in need of receiving it anew; but for all creatures it is not enough to have received life once; the life thus received, in order to be preserved, needs to be constantly communicated anew from above; and in order that it may be thus communicated, in order that the natural life in created beings may be continually renewed in them, they require food. But, this holds good too of the true, divine, and blessed life. It is not enough that it should have once been communicated from above through the medium of faith and baptism; for the maintenance of the same, it was requisite that it should ever be given to them anew from the Father, by the Son, in the Holy Ghost, through the medium of the Lord's supper.[1] "Although"—says he—"our Lord gives to Christians the beginning of a life of grace, a blessed life, through faith, as it is written, The just shall live by faith, and through baptism; yet he has in his infinite wisdom ordained this sacrament, and directed Christians to repeat it daily, or at least often, for the purpose of preserving or continuing this life of grace. The Christian, well-grounded in the faith, ought to know that Jesus the crucified is the beginning and the end of his life of grace, in the general and in the particular, because, without him, he can do nothing."[2] We may understand from these words how Matthias of Janow apprehended the relation of the holy supper to baptism; that through the Lord's supper, the divine life once received in baptism, should be renewedly and ever more completely appropriated in communion with Christ, till it should thoroughly interpenetrate the entire human nature.

Accordingly, to the objection that since eternal life is communi-

1 Est diligenter notandum, quod deus pater soli unigenito filio dedit, vitam habere in semet ipso ab aeterno et substantialiter, et nulli alterae (?) creaturae, sed quia omnes creaturae accipient participationem suae vitae a deo per filium in spiritu sancto, et quod omnes creaturae accepta vita a deo, specialiter vita beatifica et perpetua, de qua hic sermo, necesse haberent, eam accipere a deo suo, et quod non sufficit semel accipere vitam suam a deo in praesenti, sed necesse habet continue respicere, et pro vita sua conservanda et continuanda, et deum solum requirere ad hoc. Igitur per hoc deus omni creaturae viventi secundum suam specialem sapientiam atque suavitatem ordinavit cibum et apposuit, ut sic per cibi sui proprii crebram vel continuam sumptionem continuaret delectabiliter et suaviter suam vitam.

2 Licet dominus dat principium vitae gratuitae et beatificae Christianis per fidem, sicut scriptum est: Justus autem meus ex fide vivit, et per baptismum, tamen cum hoc ex immensa sua sapientia et bonitate ordinavit, hoc sacramentum altaris et statuit Christianis iterandum quotidie aut alias saepe ad eandem vitam gratiae conservandam et continuandam.

cated in the Lord's supper, it is enough to have received it once, he replies: "This does not follow; for God, in his infinite providence, has not so ordained it; but rather thus, that the man who seeks it, and in spirit partakes of it daily, should possess it." He employs the following illustration: "The sun continually gives out his light and communicates that element to our eyes; but he that would take the sunlight into his eyes and enjoy the blessing of it, must have his eyes turned to the light, and be susceptible of its influences; and he must *constantly* receive the light from the sun, or as often as he would use it. But if he shuts his eyes, or from some accident ceases to receive the light constantly radiating from the sun, he shortly loses the whole, nor is a particle to be had till he turns once more to the sun." He calls the holy supper the food, which has been prepared for and given to men wounded, weak, and blind, to unclean sinners, to those who sigh and mourn over their sins. He complains of the clergy who were not willing to distribute to *these* the food designed expressly for their use, but reserved it for angels, waited for angels, waited for such as led an angel-like life, to come and appropriate it; or who would only partake of it for themselves, because they were called the angels for the people, or were set over them as such; when the truth was, they were neither like the angels, nor set over them, but had been taken from that sinful race of man, and were set among sinful men, and over them. "Such bad stewards"—he says—"crush to the earth, in their way of prescribing and of administering penance, the little ones in Christ, by a wisdom which, as it comes not from the Spirit of our most loving and bounteous Saviour, must needs be called a fleshly wisdom. It was their fault that such persons fell back into sin, torn away as they were, so cruelly and violently, from the breast of their mother. He taxes them, namely, with troubling the consciences of these persons by requiring of them too severe a life, and laying on their necks intolerable burdens. He condemns the current opinion that it was quite sufficient for Christian laymen, if, after the preparation of the fasts, they partook of the communion once at Easter festival. "When those days are over"—says he—"they soon forget the whole, and fall back again into their old vain habits of life. They relax from the holy discipline they had commenced, and begin once more to put themselves on a level with this vain world, so that the man is

scarcely if ever to be found, who, after having gone through his penance and received the holy sacrament, perseveres in the right way, and worthily reforms his life according to the requirements of Christianity." To such outside repentance he applies what Christ says of the evil spirit driven from a man and then returning with seven others still worse than himself. The poor people are thus led to suppose that things forbidden are to be avoided only on fast days, that at these seasons alone penance is necessary to be done, and that it suffices, for salvation, to confess one's sins and receive the body and blood of the Lord, without once thinking of his passion, or voluntarily suffering with him. "But with all this, they hold fast to the freedom of the flesh, conform in all else to this world, love the world and that which is of it the whole day. The same Christian people"—he says—"I think they are safely in Christ when, in carnal security, they have observed, according to custom, the things of religion, without any of the true life and spirit of Jesus the crucified. O, blindness of Israel!"—he exclaims—"O, fatal mistake! which, if it were possible, might deceive even God's elect; O, deceitful and partial spirit of Satan; and alas! for the sufferings of the saints, who truly repent, who on account of this communion are insulted and despised by their seemingly pious brethren, and accused of heresy!" He then refers back to an example which had been cited against him, to the case of those old eremites, who could only receive the holy supper at rare intervals, and remarks: "With these persons, it was altogether another affair; they had lived an angel-like life; and what might be true of them, could not be applied to those, who were placed amid the conflicts of the world. Those eremites had no priest to distribute the Lord's supper to them. In such cases, the Lord Christ is ever wont to supply, by his own presence, the absence of priests." To the objection that a special preparation is necessary in order to worthy participation in the communion, he replies: The preparation of souls for this festival does not require a forty-days' fast; for the spirit of a Christian must be one ever pressing onward, never retrograding; one ever rising in aspiration and prayer to God; ever open to divine impressions. "But even suppose the spirit not to be in this right state of preparation; yet it may transport itself at once into the proper frame. For spirit and will are not bound to time or to

place. For to these conditions men's bodies are subject, but not the soul and spirit; the latter perform their actions in a sphere out of space and time."[1]

"The activity of the spirit, and especially when turned upon spiritual things, excludes the train of successive motions; for it proceeds from that which is incapable of division, and relates to that which is incapable of division and above space and time, which introduce succession.[2] Next, a worthy preparation cannot proceed from the spirit of man, but must proceed rather from the spirit of Christ, which is omnipotent, and in which therefore no division of successive moments can find place in matters pertaining to its own essence, namely, spiritual things. What is said in Holy Scripture of the paschal lamb once offered, has reference only to the one sacrifice offered by Christ; but far from us be the thought that Christians are to celebrate the memory of Christ's passion only once a year,—a remembrance which ought on the contrary to be uninterruptedly present to their minds."[3] He supposes the case of a priest who should say to a person wishing to receive the communion, Go away; for to-day thou art unworthy; and come back worthier to-morrow or in a week; in the place of such a person he would reply, I know I am unworthy; therefore it is that I come begging and trembling to thee; because thou hast received in my behalf from my God and Jesus Christ the power to render me worthy who am unworthy, since by thy prayer thou canst absolve me, and by giving me my portion of our daily bread, canst change me into the same; and all that pertains to the making me worthy of that bread I have already, in my perfect will; for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good, I find not. But all that which the Spirit must further produce out of me and in me, I hope to find in that daily bread. Therefore I beg of you to give me this day our daily

1 Quodsi forte est spiritus in eo non praeparatus, tunc spiritus potest subito praeparari, tum quia spiritus seu mens aut voluntas non requirit tempus, non locum; his enim corpora sunt subjecta, non mens, non spiritus hominis, sed omnino suas operationes agunt extra tempus et locum.

2 Tum quia actus mentis et spiritus, praecipue quoad divina, sunt sine motu successivo, quoniam sunt indivisibilium ad indivisibilia supra locum et tempus, quae deferunt successionem.

3 Absit autem hoc a Christianis, quod debeant solum semel in anno agere memoriam dominicae passionis, quae continuis momentis debet in ipsorum pectoribus demorari.

bread, and am in haste for it. Thus strengthened and enlightened, and made alive in Christ, I shall in him find a way to accomplish what is already present in my will. But if thou deemest me not worthy *to-day* to receive from thee the daily bread, as I am *to-day* unworthy, so neither wilt thou present it to me to-morrow; because neither to-morrow, nor the next day, nor ever, so long as I live in this body of death and sin, shall I be worthy enough of this our heavenly bread, so far as that itself is concerned. He stands up for the pious laymen who demanded with importunity the daily communion, and vindicating them from the reproach of rashness, declares it rather a work of the grace of God and of necessity. "As regards the former"—says he—"I assume it to be well known, that the longing to partake of Christ's body and blood, from faith and love, does not spring from flesh and blood, and *cannot* spring from them; but only from the operation of divine grace or from the spirit of Jesus Christ." He proceeds to speak of those who, bowed down under a sense of their sins, dare not come forward to partake of the holy supper, and remarks that persons in this temper of mind, who are so deeply penetrated with the sense of their own unworthiness, are the most worthy of all. "Hence that person"—he says—"is in the end filled with still greater love and ardent longing for the Lord Jesus, who at the very time he falls into such divers temptations, flies to the Lord Jesus, and hurries to his sacrament, and though all would frighten him from it, still answers: Against *him only* have I sinned, and done evil in his sight, and therefore I fly to *him alone;* for though he slay me, yet will I trust in him, and though he thrust me down to hell, still I know that even in this he does what is best, for he cannot do wrong; and I trust that he will also bring me out of the pit, He who alone casteth down to hell, and bringeth up therefrom." In this he sees the character of true love, which casteth out fear, which is stronger than death, which many waters cannot quench nor floods drown. When in opposition to these views was held up the necessity of submission to ecclesiastical order, the direction of Christ to his disciples to observe and do whatsoever was bidden them by those who sat in Moses' seat, he answered: "Yes, if they build up the communities and put forth godly commands; but if they knowingly pull them down, and teach men to sin, we

are by no means bound to obey them in these things, but ought rather to follow the inward anointing, which teacheth all things, or the spirit of Jesus Christ, who is everywhere, and especially in God's children, whom he himself directly guides, as the only teacher and true shepherd." It was necessary to obey God rather than men, to try the spirits to see whether they were of God. He affirms, that the primitive priest following Christ's example had always *first* taken the holy supper himself, and then distributed it to the others in order. Such had continued to be the practice from the time of the Apostles for the period of a thousand years, until in these more recent times, through the increase and spread of sin, this perpetual sacrifice had been abolished. To the objection that the spiritual participation was sufficient, he answers: "It is something greater, something more permanently for the saving good of the Christian to eat and drink the incarnate Word in the most inward and real manner, than to hear and believe his words. The truth did not declare that He who speaketh or he who heareth my words, the same shall abide in me and I in him; but Christ repeatedly says: He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood remaineth in me and I in him." It was objected by opponents, that the holy supper would by too frequent use become too every-day an affair, and lose its true significance. To this he replies: "Never will Christians grow weary of it: on the other hand, the longer they intermit it, the more will the holy longing for it abate in them, and the pains which they would otherwise take to enjoy it diminish. Another delight, the lust of the flesh, will take possession of the soul, darken it, and cause it to forget that holy joy in the sacrament. By worldliness the spirit is rendered daily more unfit for receiving the holy supper." This truth he finds typified in the behaviour of the Jews with the manna; when they longed after the fleshpots and cucumbers of Egypt, the manna was no longer relished; and when they arrived in the land of promise, and began to busy themselves with cultivating the fruits of the earth, the manna was taken from them. A simple spiritual participation was sufficient, and might be substituted for the bodily, where the longing was present, but for unavoidable reasons could not be satisfied. "By special privilege"—he says —"not according to the common rule, Christ himself brings

about in the most hidden manner the spiritual participation of his body by those of whom he knows it to be true, that they worthily long to partake of his body, and would gladly receive it every day, and pray for it, in their prayers to God in the Paternoster, and in those of men, the ministers of the church,— Christians who, when they cannot enjoy the privilege of the sacrament, mourn and sigh over the deprivation with an unendurable hunger and thirst, such and such alone does the spirit of Christ visit directly, when and where he pleases, causing them by virtue of his own grace to manducate spiritually and bodily, sometimes in the mass, sometimes *after* the mass, morning or evening, by night or by day, in a secret and invisible manner."[1] He re-affirms it over and over that pious laymen stood in no respect whatever inferior to the priests as proper subjects for the enjoyment of the Lord's supper, but frequently surpassed them in holy simplicity and innocence. In partaking of that sacrament the most important qualification was great simplicity of faith: hence all human science served rather to distract and dissipate, to destroy devotion, fervency of the affections, and stability of faith.[2] It is evident from the passages above cited that Matthias of Janow constantly pre-supposes no difference to exist, as to the privilege of the full enjoyment of the holy supper in both kinds, between priests and laymen; and he expressly points to the sacrifices of the Old Testament as ante-types of this sacrament in as far as both forms belonged to its completeness and integrity;[3] and, as he says, that the whole multitude should taste the sweetness of the sacrament that is hidden beneath the species

1 Illis dico spiritus Jesu manducationem sui corporis spiritualem ex singulari privilegio, non ex communi pacto et ordinatione solusmet operatur intime, quos ipse videt, quam digne affectant Christi corpus manducare et vellent omni die, et hoc rogant et apud deum in oratione dominica et apud homines et ministros ecclesiae, et si fieri ipsis sacramentaliter non potest, dolent et ingemiscunt, fame et siti vexati, in spiritu suo et necessitate male patientes; talibus igitur solum occurrit spiritu Jesu Christi, et plurimum si vult et quando vult et cum vult, ex sua gratia faciens ipsos corporaliter spiritualiter manducare, aliquando in missa, aliquando post missam, post prandium, de mane, de vespere, in nocte vel in die, latenter et occulte.

2 Simplicitate sancta et innocentia, quo ad hoc ipsis plebejis suffragante praecipue circa beatificum altaris sacramentum, ubi requiritur maxima simplicitas sanctae fidei Christianae; et omnis scientia humana ideo magis ibidem venit ad dissipationem, devotionis et caritatis destructionem et in credendo firmitatem.

3 Sacrificium legis fuit hoc sacrificium — — propter dualitatem *utriusque speciei*, panis et vini, ex quibus hoc sacrificium integratur.

of bread and wine, it follows that in his view the whole multitude should partake of both forms of the Lord's supper.[1]

Matthias of Janow, as we have already remarked in passing, mentions among the signs of the time which indicated the degeneracy of the church, and announced the coming in of antichrist, the schism between the two popes; and in common with many of the best men of his age he regarded this schism as a symptom of the distempered condition of the church and an admonition from God designed to bring men to the consciousness of her corruption and to awaken the longing for her regeneration. This schism he ascribes to the pleasure-pursuing, pomp-loving, worldly spirit of the cardinals. "It never arose"—he says—"from any love which the cardinals had for Christ and his church, but from their love of themselves and their love of the world.[2] Nor did this schism tend ultimately to the injury of the church, but was rather a benefit, inasmuch as the kingdom of antichrist would thereby be more easily and more speedily destroyed. Those days would be shortened for the elect's sake. Besides, the church would get rid of the numberless multitude of hypocrites." He affirms, too, that it was only the external appearance of the church which could be affected by this schism, her essential being was raised above its influence. "The body of the omnipotent and altogether indivisible Jesus Christ, the community of saints, is not divided, neither indeed can be divided:"—that church which, by virtue of its eternal and immutable unity, depends wholly on the unity of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of his spirit. As he discovers in the prevailing selfish element the cause of all divisions of the church and of all her corruptions, so it seems to him that restoration of church unity and a reformation of the church can proceed only from the overcoming of that selfish element. He says, the blissful unity of the church can never be truly restored, until men governed by self-love are removed entirely out of the way, and their places filled by those in vastly multiplied numbers

1 Et omnis multitudo dulcedinis sacramento sub speciebus panis et vini abscondita; and, in the passage above quoted, the important words in this view: Omnes Christiani, quotquot ibidem congregati, sumebant communiter *de illo pane* coelesti a ministerio *et de calice*, ita quod primus sacerdos accepit, *dehinc dedit omnibus*.

2 Cum non ex eo schisma hoc factum est, quod dilexissent Christum Jesum et ejus ecclesiam, sed ex eo, quod se ipsos amaverunt et hunc mundum.

who overflow with zeal for the true unity of the church,—men who seek not their own but the things of Jesus Christ; which self-seeking he applies not to those alone who seek their own in the things of this world, but to those also who in *spiritual* things are seeking only to set up themselves and their party, looking down with contempt upon all others.[1] As one symptom of the fall of the church, and a premonitory sign of the last times, he considers the various oppositions of party, of which each would claim Christ exclusively for itself;—the party of the Roman popes among the Italians, the party of the popes at Avignon among the French; the Greek church, the different orders of monks, spiritual and secular fraternities. Everywhere the cry was: Lo here is Christ, and lo there is Christ. The Church was no longer a city on a hill, conspicuous to all, but split into three parts.[2] But although he reckons schism generally among the signs of corruption, yet the greatest right belonged in his opinion comparatively speaking to Urban VI.; and he regarded it generally as a work of Satan and antichrist, that Clement VI. should gain such power against the *lawful* pope; and that so many persons distinguished even for intelligence could be deceived. "Antichrist"—he says—"has exalted himself against the true pope, Urban VI. He has persecuted and killed the saints; and attacked the entire church with such party spirit and craft, that he has drawn wholly over to himself the sacred college of the cardinals and made other colleges wavering, and the whole body of the wise, as for example, the University of Paris and other universities."

We have already observed, however, since the time of Militz, the antagonism between a reform and anti-reform tendency among the clergy and laity had been continually evolving itself. Mat-

1 Ego illos hic puto magis se ipsos amantes et quae sua sunt inquirentes private, qui non tam in rebus corporalibus et variis, quae sua sunt quaerunt, non quae proximorum vel communitatis Christi fidelium, sed et in rebus spiritualibus et primariis tantum sua commoda inquirunt, exsortes ab amore communis fraternitatis christianae, qua composita est ex perfectis et imperfectis, ex justis et infirmis.

2 Civitas illa magna orbis christianorum in tres partes de facto est conscissa, sive Romanos ad meridiem, Graecos ad orientem, Francigenas ad occidentem.—Ecce obscuritas solis et lunae, ut et civitas posita supra montem abscondita et obnubilata, quod videri non possit.—Hodie dicunt Francigenae cum suo occidentali comitivo: hic est Christus, Italici vero et Romani ad meridiem affirmant dicentes: imo hic est Christus et non alibi. Et ecclesia Graecorum ad orientem asseverat pertinaciter dicens: non ibi nec alibi, sed hic nobiscum est Christus.

thias of Janow was, without doubt, at this time the centre and nucleus of the reform tendency; as we might easily infer, indeed, that he would be, from his principles thus far unfolded; and he himself, in various places, mentions the existence of this antagonism: "They"—says he—"who are apostles and preachers of antichrist, oppress the apostles, the wise men and prophets of Christ, persecuting them in various ways, and boldly asserting, that these ministers of Christ are heretics, hypocrites, and antichrists.[1] And since many and mighty members of antichrist go forth in a countless variety of ways, they persecute the members of Christ who are few and weak, compelling them to go from one city to another by driving them from the synagogues (excluding them from the fellowship of the church). Whenever one of the society of such Christians ventures to be somewhat more free of speech, and to live more worthily of Christ than is common, he is directly called a beghard, or by some other heretical name, or merely set down as a hypocrite or fool. If he do but in a small degree imitate his crucified master, and confess his truth, he will experience at once a fierce persecution from some side of the thick body of antichrist. If thou dost not live just as they do, thou wilt be judged to be nothing else but a poor superstitious creature or a false guide." This antagonism became strikingly manifest at the remarkable synod of Prague, of the year 1389, when the dominant party pronounced against the principle of reform: that synod by which, as it is said, Matthias of Janow was compelled to make a recantation—particularly of the principles he held in relation to the full participation of the laity in the Lord's supper. There may be some question with regard to the nature of the explanations which he made on this occasion, and which were interpreted as a recantation. It is evident, at least, that subsequently he continued to inculcate the same principles, and was zealously opposed to that synod. Let us listen to his own words on this subject: "Alas! several colleges and the multitude of those who style themselves masters and men of wisdom, lay it down as an ordinance of God in the church, that images of wood, of stone, and of silver, and such like, are to be prayed to and worshipped by Christians, though

1 Membra fortia et multa antichristi.

Holy Scripture is in plain and express contradiction thereto :"— where he appeals to the law of the Old Testament. He ingenuously rejects, as we have already shown, the testimony cited from Thomas Aquinas and other schoolmen, in defence of this image-worship. Simply on account of this was the reproach of idolatry cast upon the church by Jews and Pagans. "Although a sophist and logician might perhaps defend himself against the arguments used by the Jews, without doing violence to his conscience and his faith; yet the unlearned people of the Christian communities are undoubtedly overcome by them, and seriously injured in purity of Christian faith." The allusion here is to the artificial interpretations and distinctions, employed among the Greeks since the seventh century, and among the Latins since the triumph of image-worship, to defend this image-worship against the reproach of idolatry, and to reconcile it with the purely spiritual worship of God; a method which the synod of Prague seems also to have employed. But Matthias of Janow, a man so watchfully observant of the wants of the people, knew how little capable the simple laity were of comprehending all this, and how much the purity of faith among them must accordingly suffer injury or be disturbed thereby. Hence he remarks: "Teachers say a great deal in the schools, which ought never to be so preached before the common people; though holy church has tolerated images and figures, and teaches that they may be venerated, yet she has never taught that they should be prayed to or adored." Then, after having shown the corrupting influence of an extravagant image-worship on the religious life, and of the custom of extolling the miracles wrought by them, he remarks: "Yet there are at the present day many great and famous men who hold that such things are of use to the simple; nay, that it is useful to preach such things, because men should piously believe, that such things are of God. God, then, according to what they affirm, has, in these times, passed by his saints and his chosen, and turned his regard to images of stone. And as God has ceased to perform his wonders in his own name and by his word, he now works them through wood and stones.[1] Or does a holy and faithful God, perhaps, display his power by these images and other such lifeless things?

[1] Igiturne propterea, quod cessavit dominus Jesus miracula et virtutes suas in nomine suo et per verbum operari, jam per lapides et ligna operatur?

And would he thus, by making that power depend on such images, secure an entrance among his Christian people for the idolatry of the pagans? Or would he, by this, show favour to Satan, that the latter, making himself like God, might, by lying works, be able to appropriate divine honours to himself? Or is it perhaps permitted the great enemy, in punishment of unthankful Christians, to enter into all forms of seduction and falsehood, carrying out through the instrumentality of men that seem to others very pious and holy, but are not so in fact, his work of seduction by performing his signs and wonders through them? They have decided and ordained by synodal decree that it should be preached to the people that they ought piously to believe a divine power resides in wooden images, and painted canvas." And he goes on to say: "Who can fail to perceive, how corrupting this must be to the rude and sensuous people, when he but considers that the people of the laity at the present day, who have not the spirit of the Lord Jesus, are not at all able to rise in spirit to spiritual things!" And he adds: Because some preachers of the church of Christ and of his cross, have not disputed the propriety of the thing in general, that men should have images, but have attacked by sound Christian doctrine the fables and inventions of men and the deceptions of certain individuals,[1] therefore the above-mentioned men of wisdom have assailed these preachers, held them up to public scorn, and sought in every way to compel them to utter falsehood;[2] then they have taken advantage of their silence for the present to circulate these stories, the truth of Christ being thus trampled under foot.[3] "How then can that man"—he says—"who sees that the truth stands thus, and judges correctly of individual facts, say or believe otherwise than that those times of antichrist are at hand, when he finds that such an ordinance has resulted from the long deliberation of our wise men, teachers and doctors of theology

1 Quibusdam praedicatoribus ecclesiae Christi et ejus crucis, eo quod non quidem imagines habendas, sed fabulas et talia fictitia hominum atque deceptiones quorundam sunt aggressi impugnandum per doctrinam sanam Christi.

2 Mox hi praefati sapientes, comprehensis ipsis praedicatoribus, eosdem ludibrio publice expositos omnibus modis ipsos mentiri compellere sunt conati.

3 Dehinc silentium ipsis pro tempore posuerunt, ut proinde fabulae supra descriptae promotionem habeant et processum, veritate Christi Jesu siccine in platea corruente.

and of the canon law, in a solemn and famous assembly? Hence not a man was found among them to stand forth ingenuously in defence of the truth." "All that now remains for us"—he says —"is to desire and pray for reform by the destruction of antichrist himself, and to lift up our heads, for our redemption draweth nigh." He remarks, again, about that Synod of Prague, that the masters who endeavoured to draw away the laity from the frequent participation of the Lord's supper, had, in fact, forbidden by a synodal decree that this sacrament should be given to the faithful who demanded it, oftener than *once* a month. These are his words: "Alas! for myself, they have forced me by their importunate clamour at that synod to agree that the faithful generally should not be invited to daily communion."

2. *John Huss, the Bohemian Reformer.*

Next after these reformers, or men inspired with the spirit of reform, came the individual through whose instrumentality it was that the more general and violent movement for which the way had thus been prepared broke forth, in Bohemia.

John Huss was born, on the 6th of July 1369, at Hussinetz, a Bohemian village lying within the circle of Prachim and towards the borders of Bavaria. Descended from a poor family, he was early inured to labour and deprivation, and thus laid the foundation for those Christian virtues, which afterwards distinguished him. He studied philosophy and theology at the University of Prague. This university, it is true, was a seat of churchly orthodoxy; but at the same time the antagonistic tendencies of two different nationalities seem already to have begun there gradually to unfold themselves—the strict church tendency of the Germans, as opposed to the more liberal one of the Bohemians. The teacher of Huss, Stanislaus of Znaim, belonged to the more liberal party, as we shall hereafter see. In the year 1396, Huss received his master's degree, and began himself to lecture, at the university, in the year 1398. A man, however, of his Christian seriousness and deep-seated piety, must certainly have felt himself shocked and repelled by the worldly lives of the degenerate Bohemian clergy and monks, and driven, in this way,

into a more confirmed habit of communing with himself and seeking after God. We have seen indeed how, ever since the times of John Militz, an opposition had been springing up between the great majority of worldly priests and a smaller company earnestly devoted to their holy vocation and to the cause of God among the Bohemian clergy. We have seen how Militz gave birth to a tendency that connected itself more closely with the New Testament, and how, in particular, Matthias of Janow directed attention to the apostolical church, and to a reform after the pattern of that church. Huss could not have remained unaffected by such influences. Between the two parties, then already struggling with each other in Bohemia, he must soon have made his choice. The influence of Matthias of Janow's writings on his direction as a theologian, is not to be mistaken. A circumstance which had much to do in moulding the religious character of Huss, and in beating the path for his active labours as a reformer, was his call to discharge the spiritual office in a sphere where he could obtain a more intimate knowledge of the religious needs of the people, and was brought into more immediate and living contact with them. In the year 1391, John of Milheim, a member of the royal council of Bohemia, and Creutz, a merchant (the latter of whom gave the real estate, a house which belonged to him, for the object), associated for the purpose of founding a chapel, to be devoted particularly to the preaching of the gospel in the vulgar tongue, for the benefit of the people. We have an example, here, of that practical Christian spirit which, since the time of Militz's labours, had been awakened among the laity in Bohemia, and to the existence of which Matthias of Janow bore his testimony, as we have seen. This spirit is also evidenced, in a remarkable manner, in the original title-deed of the foundation, which runs as follows: "The merciful God, who in the seed of his word has left behind him a provision for them that fear him, so ordered it, by the institutions of the fathers, that the preaching of God's word should not be bound, it being the freest as it is the most profitable act for the church and her members;" and then, after appealing for proof to Christ's words, the founder goes on to say: "For had he not bequeathed to us the seed of God's word and of holy preaching, we should have been like unto Sodom and Gomorrha. Christ moreover had given commission to his disciples, when he

appeared to them after his resurrection, to preach the word, so as to preserve constantly in the world the living memory of himself. But since all his actions are doctrines to them that truly believe on him, he (the founder) had carefully considered that the city of Prague, though possessing many places consecrated to the worship of God and used for a variety of purposes connected with that worship, was still destitute of a place devoted especially to preaching; but preachers, particularly in the Bohemian tongue, were under the disagreeable necessity of strolling about for this purpose, to houses and corners; therefore the founder endowed a chapel consecrated to the Innocents, and named 'Bethlehem,' or the House of Bread, for the use of the common people, that they might be refreshed with the bread of holy preaching."[1] Over this church a preacher was to be placed as rector, whose special duty it should be, to hold forth the word of God, on every Sunday and festival day, in the Bohemian tongue.[2] It is a proof of the high reputation in which Huss already stood, and of the expectations excited by the peculiar bent of his religious character, that in the year 1401 he should be appointed the preacher over this foundation. His sermons, glowing with all that fervour of love from which they proceeded, and backed up by a pious, exemplary life, coupled with gentle and amiable manners, made a powerful impression. A little community gathered around him, of warm and devoted friends; and a new Christian life started forth, from him, among the people. He became more intimately acquainted, as a curer of souls to the lower class of the people, with the corrupting influence of a religion reduced entirely to a round of outward ceremonies, and of the superstition which gave countenance and support to immorality, and was thus led to attack the sources of so much mischief, to dwell with increasing earnestness upon the essence of a practical Christianity,

1 Quam Bethlehem quod interpretatur domus panis, censui appellandam hac consideratione, ut ibidem populus communis et Christi fideles pane praedicationis sanctae refici debeant. See Pelzel, account of the life of King Wenceslaus, Prague, 1788; Document No. 81, p. 103.

2 Words of the Record of foundation respecting his duties: Ut dictus capellanus ad sonum campanum diebus singulis ab ecclesia celebribus mane et facto prandio, et tempore adventus et quadragesimae mane tantum horis solitis, et prout in aliis ecclesiis praedicari est consuetum, verbum dei communi populo civitatis in vulgari Bohemico sit ad praedicandum astrictus. Pag. 105.

bringing forth its fruits from a principle seated in the heart, and to rebuke with emphatic severity the prevailing vices. So long as he chiefly attacked the corruption among the laity, he was left unmolested. The new archbishop of Prague, Zbynek of Hasenburg, appointed to that office in the year 1403, was not himself, by any means, a man of purely spiritual bent, but one accustomed to mingle freely in secular affairs, and even to take a part in warlike enterprises; yet he was opposed to ecclesiastical abuses, and to the superstition therewith connected. He was desirous of introducing a stricter discipline into his diocese, and he must have had some knowledge of Huss, and have esteemed him as a zealous reformer; for, in entering upon his duties as archbishop, he invited Huss to give him direct information of all the abuses which came under his personal observation; or, if he should not happen to be in Prague, to inform him by letter.[1] Accordingly he availed himself of the assistance and advice of Huss in an important transaction which took place soon after his entrance upon office, the object of which was to suppress a certain superstition and the abuses which had grown out of it. The matter was of this sort: at Wilsnack, in the district of Preignitz, a church had been destroyed by a knight some time in the fourteenth century. Part of a stone altar had been left standing. In one of its cavities were found three wafers, coloured red, as if with blood; a phenomenon the like of which has often occurred from the earliest times, and which has as often, under various religions, been construed into the miraculous; but a phenomenon satisfactorily explained by more recent investigations into natural causes, it being now well known that bread and similar substances, long exposed to moisture, are wont to be covered with an animal product, the constituent parts of which are discernible only under the miscroscope, but which to the naked eye bears a close resemblance to

1 This is evident from a letter written by Huss to this archbishop at the time when a rupture had already taken place between the two men, in which he adverts to the invitation then given to him. His words are: Saepissime reitero, qualiter in principio vestri regiminis mihi pro regula paternitas vestra instituerat, ut quoties-cunque aliquem defectum erga regimen conspicerem, mox personaliter aut in absentia per literam defectum hujusmodi nuntiarem. This fragment of the letter was first published by the Bohemian historian, Palacky, in his history of Bohemia, III. 1 p. 216.

blood.[1] But in these times, the remarkable appearance was regarded as a symbol of the blood of Christ. The report of so extraordinary a miracle created a great sensation: stories were soon circulated, of wonderful cures performed on the spot; numerous pilgrimages were made to it from Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Hungary, Poland, and Bohemia. Various tricks would naturally be resorted to, in that age, by the corrupt clergy and monks, to help on the self-deception, which could not fail to be attended with great mischief to the religious and moral life of the people. Archbishop Zbynek appointed, therefore, a committee of three masters to inquire into the matter; and as their report was unfavourable to the pilgrims, the spurious character of those pretended miracles having been exposed, Zbynek put forth an order prohibiting all such pilgrimages from his own diocese. One of these masters was Huss, who probably had great influence in bringing about the decision.[2] This was his first opportunity of standing forth publicly against superstition, and it was done under the authority of the archbishop himself. He composed, on this occasion, his paper on the proper mode of regarding the glorified blood of Christ.[3] In this tract it is very evident that he was still entirely given to the prevailing doctrines of the church, even on the article of transubstantiation; but he ventured already to call in question the stories generally believed since the time of Paschasias Radbert, relative to the miraculous appearances of the body and blood of Christ. We already find in him a representative of the genuine Christian spirit, as opposed to the miracle-hunting spirit of his age. "The glorified body of Christ"—he says—"exists dimensionally in heaven alone, though truly and really in the sacrament of the altar. Nothing that belonged to this body could be separated from it and present, by itself, alone upon earth. All that is said, therefore, about relics of Christ's body, or of his blood, as being present in this place or that, must be false. He who pretends to believe anything of

1 See the Extract from Ehrenberg's paper on the Monas prodigiosa in the monthly report of the Academy of Sciences in Berlin, for October, 1848.

2 Huss himself mentions this commission: Etiam fuimus tres magistri deputati per dominum archiepiscopum ad examinandum homines, de quibus praedicabant fuisse facta miracula. Fol. 162, 2.

3 Determinatio quaestiones, cum suo tractatulo de omni sanguine Christi glorificato. Joannis Hus opera, Norimberg. 1558, tom. i. fol. 154 pag. 2 sq.

this sort, dishonours the blood of Christ, no less than if he worshipped, under that name, the blood of a dead horse. But alas!" —he says—"the iniquity of greedy ecclesiastics has increased to such extent that messengers of antichrist, following their master the devil, have exhibited their own blood as the blood of Christ, at the eucharist, and the same is adored by foolish and unbelieving Christians, who unbelievingly seek after wonders." He calls those who were seeking after such wonders, more unbelieving than Thomas, because though after the Lord had shown himself to the unbelieving Thomas he believed, they would not believe on him even when glorified and exalted at the right hand of the Father, but required sensible signs of his presence. Christ was now hidden from sight, present only to faith; this constituted the essence of faith, the meritum fidei, that it takes hold of things hidden, invisible; this was therefore more wholesome and conducive to the life of religion than if the blood of Christ were visibly present. We ought confidently to believe that if it had been better for us to see Christ bodily present among us, he would not have deprived us of this privilege. But because faith would be destitute of merit, if accompanied with the experience of sense, therefore Christ with his blood has been pleased to withdraw himself from our sight. He applies to his contemporaries what St Paul says of the sign-seeking spirit of the Jews, to whom Christ crucified was a stumbling block. Like Matthias of Janow, he is inclined to attribute the miracles with which the wicked clergy sought to delude the people, to evil spirits. The laity, by their confidence in such miracles, were drawn away from the essential thing, true love, and hardened in their sins. Like Matthias of Janow, he applies the words of Christ to those that would say, Lo! here is Christ, or there, to those who said, The blood of Christ is here, or it is there; they were not to be believed. Like Matthias of Janow, he looks upon those pious frauds by which the laity were led astray, as the present secretly-working power of antichrist, and applies to them what St Paul, in the epistles to the Thessalonians, says of the workings of antichrist. The faithful should, in a proper way, use all diligence to live simply according to the law of the Gospel, and put no faith in fables and lying wonders, or wonders actually wrought by evil spirits or wicked men. Thus would they, in a more quiet man-

ner, grow confirmed in the faith of the Lord. Such miracles rendered it the more necessary for each individual to fortify himself with the word of God, so as to avoid being deceived by false prophets and false Messiahs, whose appearance Christ foretold. He cites one example of fraud: A citzen of Prague, with a lame hand, had hung up a silver hand as a votive offering, in honour of the bloody wafers in Wilsnack. Wishing, however, to test the honesty of the priests, he staid three days in the place; but before the time expired, he must hear how a priest had publicly referred to this offering of the silver hand, as a proof of the miraculous cure of the lame one. The citizen of Prague convicted him of the falsehood by showing his hand, which remained as lame as ever. And for the truth of this statement, Huss appeals to the testimony of many who knew the person referred to. "Truly" —he says—"if the priests faithfully observed Christ's evangelical counsel and preached *Christ's words* to the people, rather than lying wonders, our gracious Saviour would guide the steps of both priests and people out of the bad way, the way of sin and falsehood." He complains that, in their distresses, people were more inclined to invoke help from the blood of Christ, than from God, and to place their hopes upon a mere creature than upon the Creator. Even now, says he, it is not easy to find a district which is not famous for some appearance of the blood of Christ. The worst transgressors, robbers and the like, were made to feel secure in sin by their confidence in such blood, and these were the best patrons and friends of this miraculous blood, though they persecuted Christ himself, and unrighteously shed his blood, in his members.

The archbishop had directed the curates to announce on every Sunday that the pilgrimage to Wilsnack was forbidden on pain of the ban.

But though the young archbishop stood at the beginning on these friendly terms with Huss, still we might be led to presume from the different spirit of the two men, that it would be impossible for them to unite their efforts in promoting reform except to a *certain extent*, and that an occasion might easily arise in which this *internal* opposition would be forced to show itself by some *outward* manifestation. It was impossible that Huss, with the spirit of reform by which he was actuated, should stop short at the bounds which the archbishop from the position which he

occupied would be apt to prescribe to himself. In connexion with the antagonism of the reform and anti-reform tendencies existing in the movements of the time, it would not be long before such an occasion must present itself. Aside from the political interests, which afterwards became mixed in, Huss could not fail in the end to be involved by his very principles of reform, which led him farther than he could calculate upon, in a quarrel with the archbishop. For Huss, who was governed solely by the religious interest, would be continually led by it to take one step after another in his attacks on the corruption of the church; whilst, on the other hand, Zbynek was induced by reasons of policy to stop short, as soon as he had any grounds to apprehend that he was coming into conflict with the hierarchical system. Huss needed no excitement from without to keep his zeal for reform in vigorous activity. One thing, moreover, which must have had great influence in giving the turn to his theological development, was, that he had diligently devoted himself to the study of the Bible, of the old church fathers, particularly Augustin, in whose writings he seems to have been deeply read, and of Robert of Lincoln;—of all which we have abundant evidence in his writings. In the ideas thrown out by Matthias of Janow, the needful matter had already been supplied; and from these alone, without any additional influence from Wicklif, a contest might in these times easily evolve itself, capable of being pushed to any extreme by the opposition of the great anti-reform party. Whatever lies involved in principles that have once found entrance into human consciousness, is ever shaped forth and carried still further out by the movements of history. We find in the principles of Janow the incipient germ of the whole reform movement in Bohemia; and it might have remained wholly national, wholly independent of the English spirit. And, in fact, we may constantly observe this difference, that, in the theology of Oxford, the speculative spirit was the predominant one; while the Bohemian reform, from those first promoters and representatives of it, whose characters we have already described, had taken an altogether practical direction. It is true, that so far as it regards the consequences which outwardly manifested themselves at first, it had great influence, as will hereafter appear, that the reform spirit in Prague stood in some connection with the opinions of Wicklif, denounced as heretical. The reform

movements in Bohemia would not, perhaps, separated from this connection, have risen so suddenly to so great importance; still we cannot on this account agree with those who ascribe to Wicklif's writings so great an influence on the development of the reform opposition to the hierarchy in Bohemia. It is, moreover, of great importance here, to anything like a right understanding of the phenomena of the religious and theological spirit, to disguish well internal and external causes, internal and external connections. And if, on the one hand, through the influence of Wicklif's writings, and the connection of the movements originating with Huss with those excited by Wicklif, the position of the reform party in Bohemia afterwards became a dangerous one, still we must consider, on the other hand, that it was precisely owing to the way in which Huss connected himself with Wicklif, that a large number of friends and adherents were procured for him at the outset, whom he could hardly have gained by the purely reform and anti-hierarchical interest;—friends, indeed, who, for the very reason that they did not sympathise at all with the interest for a purely Christian reform which actuated Huss from the beginning, did not harmonise with him in temper and spirit, and would on that very account be soon led to separate from him, and even to come out against him. Only so long as it was an affair of the school, and particularly of the philosophical school, and this affair was treated as a common cause of the nation, could they remain connected with him; but this very circumstance which, at the outset, gave to the party of Huss so great an ascendancy at Prague University, could not have existed independently of the connection between the reform tendency in Bohemia and the cause of Wicklif's school; as will be apparent from the facts now to be presented.

A Bohemian princess, Anna, sister to King Wenceslaus, had married Richard II, king of England.[1] This would of course lead the way to a more familiar intercourse between the two nations; and the disciples of Wicklif who were enthusiastic in their endeavours to diffuse the writings, the philosophical and theological doctrines of their master, would assuredly not fail to

1 She was in the habit of reading the New Testament; and carried with her to England a book of the gospels in the Latin, German, and Bohemian tongues. Comp. Palacky iii. 1 p. 24.

take advantage of such an opening for this purpose. The connection also between the two flourishing universities, which doubtless, independently of this event, was a lively one, would be still more promoted by it. Young English theologians came from Oxford to Prague. Bohemians studied in Oxford, and were there seized with enthusiasm for the doctrines of Wicklif; though we should not lose sight of the fact, that Wicklif was not merely the representative of a particular theological bent, but also by philosophical writings, having no connection whatever with the theological interest, and particularly by his work already mentioned, which created an epoch of its own, the treatise on the reality of general conceptions, was one of the most important representatives of the philosophical school of realism; and, though with him, as we have seen, the philosophical and theological interest, philosophical and theological principles were intimately connected, yet this was not at all a necessary connection in itself; and one might adopt the philosophical opinions of Wicklif, esteem him highly as a philosopher, without agreeing with him on that account in his theological views. From this it is the more easily to be explained how Wicklif's writings might already for a long time have been considerably read at the University of Prague, without creating any ecclesiastical movements whatever, or rendering the orthodoxy of those persons suspected, who occupied themselves with the study of certain writings of Wicklif. Huss himself declares in a paper composed about the year 1411,[1] that for thirty years, therefore from the year 1381, writings of Wicklif were read at Prague University, and that he himself had been in the habit of reading them for more than twenty years, that is, before the year 1391.[2]

It is evident from what has been said, that the spread of Wicklif's writings in Prague fell within the last years of the life of Matthias of Janow; yet, although traces perhaps of a reference to doctrines of Wicklif may be discovered in his work already noticed, still he must have occupied himself but very little with them, and they must have exercised little or no particular influ-

1 Replica contra Anglicum Joannem Stokes, opp. 1, fol. 108.

2 Universitas ab annis triginta habet et legit libros ipsius Joan. Wicleff. Egoque et membra nostrae universitatis habemus et legimus illos libros ab annis viginti et pluribus. Ibid.

ence on his mind. He pursued his course after an independent manner in the path to which the suggestions that came originally from Militz had conducted him. But Huss, as we may gather with certainty from his own language already cited, had at a very early period read many of Wicklif's writings. What attracted him in these writings was partly the philosophical realism, partly the spirit of reform as opposed to the secularization of the church, of the monastic orders, and of the clergy, which they contained, and that inclination to adhere to the New Testament as the only source of doctrine, the striving after a renovation of the Christian life in the sense of apostolical Christianity. Let us hear the words of Huss himself on this point: "I am drawn to him"—he says—"by the reputation he enjoys with the good, not the bad priests of the University of Oxford, and generally with the people, though not with the bad, covetous, pomp-loving, dissipated prelates and priests. I am attracted by his writings, in which he expends every effort to conduct all men back to the law of Christ, and especially the clergy, inviting them to let go the pomp and dominion of the world and live with the apostles according to the life of Christ. I am attracted by the love which he had for the law of Christ, maintaining its truth and holding that not one jot or tittle of it could fail."[1] He mentions here in particular for illustration the book composed by Wicklif, on the truth of Holy Scripture, in which he endeavoured to establish the validity of the law of Christ in its whole extent. And he then adverts to the fact that many of Wicklif's writings were on purely philosophical subjects, which, as they did not at all affect the truths of faith, could be read without danger. It is evident, therefore, that Huss agreed with Wicklif only up to that point to which his interest for reform had already led him in following the steps of Matthias of Janow. To Wicklif, as we have seen, his attack on the doctrine of transubstantiation, and his peculiar views of the Lord's supper, were of especial importance; but we do not perceive that these had had any particular influence on Huss. On this matter he never passed beyond what was

1 Movent me sua scripta, quibus nititur toto conamine, omnes homines ad legem Christi reducere, et clerum praecipue, ut dimittendo saeculi pompam, dominationem vivat cum apostolis vitam Christi. Movet me affectus suus, quem ad Christi legem habuit, asserens de veritate ejus, quae non potest in uno iota vel apice fallere. Ibid. fol. 109, 1.

simply practical;—as already seen, he gave special prominence to the spiritual fellowship with Christ, to the truth that he himself is the bread of the soul, without entering more minutely into the question about the relation of the bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ.[1] Huss may have had the less hesitation about availing himself of the writings of Wicklif, inasmuch as two young men who came from Oxford to Prague, —one an Englishman,[2] the other a Bohemian, probably the

1 We find nothing in the writings of Huss, which indicates that, in respect of this doctrine, he had, as Palacky supposes, (iii. 1. s. 197 and 198), through the influence of Wicklif, been at least led to *waver*, and did not, till a later period, take a decidedly different view from Wicklif on this point. In general, we think we have not observed that Huss allowed himself to be determined in his doctrinal convictions at first more and afterwards less by the influence of Wicklif. It seems to us much more to correspond with the actual course of the development of his doctrinal opinions, to suppose that he was led by his principles and the opposition which grew out of them, step by step farther away from the church tendency, and not that he was more decided in his opposition at the beginning, and afterwards grew milder. Even, on the occasion of his trial at Prague, in 1414, of which a protocol drawn up by Peter of Mladenowitz, secretary to the Knight of Chlum, has been published in the Studien und Kritiken (Jahrg. 1837, Heft. 1), Huss absolutely repels the charge that he had ever attacked the doctrine of transubstantiation. Huss here declares that he could not possibly have spoken before the people in the Bohemian tongue on the *accidentibus sine subjecto*, because this language contained no terms whatever by which such a conception could be expressed: but he had said, guarding against any misinterpretation of his language, that as a man's body is veiled under his shirt, so the body of Christ is in a certain sense veiled beneath the form of the bread, and as the soul is concealed within the body, so the body of Christ is concealed under the figure of the bread. And he appeals for proof to the language of an ancient hymn, and to words of St Augustin, which mark a distinction between that which faith perceives, and that which is manifest to the senses in the Lord's supper. That when he speaks of a forma panis, he means to intimate the remaining behind of the substance, cannot be proved. He affirms, that when he spoke of the remaining behind of the bread in the Lord's supper, he meant only Christ the heavenly bread, which is offered in the sacrament. Now we might, it is true, *suspect* that Huss took the liberty to conceal his real opinion in this ambiguous phraseology, or that he, at a later period, resorted to sophistical interpretations of the language earlier used by him; but still we shall find no ground whatever to accuse him of any such thing. It is, in fact, one of the particulars which characterize the practical bent peculiar to Huss, to give special prominence to the statement that Christ Himself is the bread of the soul in the Lord's supper, and if now he ever laid the whole stress upon this, it may have been interpreted by his opponents as if he always spoke only of the bread present in the Lord's supper. In fact we find that Huss afterwards, in a paper hereafter to be cited, was actually under the necessity of vindicating himself against such a perversion of his language, and of explaining his real meaning.

2 We have taken no notice of the story about a picture drawn by the two Englishmen on the walls of a room which they had hired, which exhibited the contrast between the worldly entrance of the Pope into Rome, and the entrance of Christ

Count Nicholas of Faulfisch, hereafter to be mentioned, had brought with them a document authenticated by the seal of the University of Oxford, in which Wicklif's orthodoxy was duly testified. Huss is reported to have read this document from the pulpit to his congregation as a testimonial in favour of that Wicklif who had been denounced as a heretic. Now it is evident, we admit, that such a declaration was altogether opposed to the spirit of the academical authorities who then ruled at Oxford. It was a forgery, to which the seal of the university had been fradulently appended—the fabrication of false documents of this sort being at that time no uncommon thing at Oxford;[1] but it is certain that Huss himself was deceived in this case; he could know nothing about this manufactory of false documents at Oxford, and his admiration of Wicklif might in this case easily incline him to believe without further examination.[2] Furthermore, the struggle for and against Wicklif, as well as the antagonism of realism and nominalism, was an affair of national interest. Under the Emperor Charles IV., king of Bohemia, the founder of the University of Prague, many Germans had resorted thither, obtained important posts, and sought to gain on their own side the greatest influence at the university. This circumstance had excited great jealousy betwixt the two nations. Much enthusiasm was awakened at that time among the Bohemians for the maintenance of their own nationality in language

into Jerusalem, the so called *Antithesis Christi et Antichristi*, and of the commotions to which it led; because we do not certainly know that the narrative of the Hussite historian, Theobald, which, in other respects, contains many inaccurate statements, is to be relied upon, and we have found in the writings of Huss himself no allusion whatever to this affair which he is said to have touched upon in his sermons at that time.

1 The seal of the University of Oxford was much abused in those days. Petras Paganas or Payne, a clergyman, had contrived to get it into his hands, and used it for the purpose of lending an appearance of authenticity to that paper got up in favour of Wicklif, as if it were an official document. See Wood historia et antiquitates universitates Oxoniensis i. pag. 203.

2 When Huss, at his trial in Constance, on the 8th of June, was accused of publishing and using such a fraudulent document of Englishmen, he was able to make a clear and simple statement of the whole affair in justification of his conduct in the case, and to appeal to the testimony of his earlier like-minded friend, Stephen Paletz, who had been equally deceived with himself, and who now appeared at Constance as his accuser. Quamque confessus esset, propterea quod sub signo universitatis a duobus scholasticis allata esset, illique etiam de iis scholasticis quaererent, respondit: Ille amicus meus (significabat autem Stephanum Paletz) alterum ex iis aeque novit atque ego, alter nescio qui fuerit. Hermann v. d. Hardt acta concilii Constantiensis tom. iv., pag. 328.

and literature. Among the peculiar qualities of Huss belonged an ardent love of his country and people. His efforts for the cultivation of the Bohemian language and orthography were praised by those competent to judge, and his influence in this regard is said to have extended even to other Slavic populations.[1] Now as the Germans were zealous nominalists, so the Bohemians, on the other hand, were no less zealous realists, and the Bohemian theologians at the university were at first more inclined to the freer opinions and in favour of Wicklif. It was the Bohemian theological party to which Huss belonged, and to the head of which he was constantly advancing by his zeal, his active labours, and his theological culture. His teachers at the University of Prague, Stanislaus and Peter of Znaim, and his university friend, Stephen Paletz, belonged to this bent, and followed it in their writings and lectures. Stanislaus of Znaim seems indeed to have proceeded farther in the interest for Wicklif than Huss himself, in that he judged more favourably of his attack upon the doctrine of transubstantiation. Huss cites the following words of Stanislaus, which he pronounced in his commentary on the Sentences of Wicklif: "A certain teacher, Wicklif, in other things a profound philosopher and theologian, delivers this opinion, (which he cites), and has publicly and often protested, as one may find in his writings, that as an obedient son of the church he is ready to believe, when he is convinced, the contrary, nay, if it be necessary, even to suffer death in correction of his error. And many, who are less able to see than he is, denounce him as a heretic in this and other things, and defame the reputation of those who read his writings, not perceiving that among thorns may be found the most beautiful roses, even though he may really have uttered much that is heretical." And the same teacher says of the doctrine of transubstantiation: "unless a new determination of the church or a satisfactory argument can prove this, it is not requisite for the catholic faith to adopt it."[2] We should here undoubtedly keep in mind, that the doctrine of transubstantiation no longer, as in the earlier centuries of the middle age, corresponded to a bent of spirit that ruled the whole age, and to a form of intuition grounded therein;

[1] See Palacky iii., 1 S. 298 ff.

[2] Hus, responsio ad scripta magistri Stanislaus de Znoyma; opp. 1 pag. 267 et 288.

that unembarrassed, childlike faith no longer predominated; doubts would rise even in the minds of those who were most cheerfully disposed to hold fast in all things to the authority of the church, as is plain from the fact that from Duns Scotus onward, a William Occum, a Durand, a Peter d'Ailly, themselves had to acknowledge that reason and scripture would lead to a different view, if the church had not otherwise decided. Huss subsequently reproached his friend, Paletz, for his crab-like movement, and accused him of having changed from a realist to a nominalist.[1] By the German party a mock mass upon their Bohemian opponents, the Wicklifites, was got up, and in it the genealogy of Christ was thus travestied—Peter of Znaim begat Stanislaus of Znaim; Stanislaus begat Stephen Paletz, and the latter begot Huss, intimating how Wicklifitism had spread from one to the other.[2]

An individual, who had great influence on the movements called forth in Prague by the contest for and against Wicklif, was one whom we shall often have occasion to mention as a fellow-combatant with Huss, the chevalier Jerome of Prague.[3] He was one of the few knights in Bohemia, distinguished by their zeal for science and literary culture.[4] Jerome of Prague, several years younger than Huss, his youthful friend, stood faithfully by

1 Jam te cum Stanislao non poneres ad defendendum librum de universalibus; and: Fuistis realistae, cum jam sitis terministae. Responsio ad scripta Paletz; opp. i. pag. 260. Jam rebus dimissis, conversus es ad signa vel terminos, retrocedens sicut cancer. Ibid. pag. 262.

2 Missa, quam Teutonici blaspheme confinixerant, in qua per modum libri generationis primo ponitur Stanislaus, qui genuit Petrum de Znoyma, et Petrus de Znoyma genuit Paletz et Paletz genuit Hus. L. c. pag. 255, 2.

3 Jerome is mentioned (according to Aeneas Sylvius in his Historia Bohemica, cap. xxxv. who describes him as a putridus piscis: Tum quod erat familiae suae cognomen, Putridum piscem, id est, foetidum virus, in cives suos evomuit) as being connected with the noble Bohemian family of Faulfisch. But, Palacky has shown that this statement has grown out of an error, by which the Chevalier Jerome had been confounded with another less known zealous friend of Wicklif's doctrines in Prague, the Chevalier Nicholas of Faulfisch. See Palacky iii. 1 s. 192, Note 245. [Palacky ascribes the error not to Aeneas Sylvius but to his readers *Editor.*]

4 In these stirring times of the Bohemian nation there were some such. Palacky, for example, (iii. 1 p. 187), mentions the Chevalier Thomas of Stitney, the author of many papers, whose most important work appeared in the year 1374, and who was still living at the close of the fourteenth century. It characterizes the national movement in Bohemia, that even in the case of this person, a man zealously devoted to scientific and literary pursuits, the religious element, as Palacky alleges, is the predominant one in his writings.

his side, as we frequently see men the most widely differing in character and in mental gifts, in times forming epochs in the evolution of the kingdom of God, each supplying the other's deficiencies, co-operating and contending together, as did afterwards Luther and Melancthon, although the relation in the present instance was a somewhat different one. Huss, a man of more calmness and discretion, of a character at once firm and gentle, more inclined to moderation, possessed of less numerous and diversified gifts, of a less excitable spirit, fonder of retirement within himself and silent self-seclusion than of mingling in the busy turmoils of life—Jerome, full of life and ardour, of an enterprising spirit, not disposed to remain still and quiet a long time in one place, whom we find now in Oxford, next at Paris, then at Jerusalem, in Hungary, at Vienna, and in Russia, everywhere attracting observation and everywhere provoking opposition, a man possessed of a gift of discourse that bore everything before it, but who in the excitement of the moment was easily led to pass beyond proper bounds, one who needed the cool considerateness of a Huss to act as a check on his activity. Jerome had, in 1398, returned from Oxford to Prague, and brought with him many writings of Wicklif not before known, which he endeavoured to circulate through the whole country and among all ranks and conditions of people. He stood up, with great enthusiasm, for the doctrines of Wicklif. He is reported to have said: "Until now, we had nothing but the shell of science; Wicklif first laid open the kernel."

After the contest for and against Wicklif, ever excited afresh by the connection between Oxford and Prague, had gone on for a considerable time in secret, the matter finally came to an open rupture. At the request of the archiepiscopal officials and cathedral chapter of Prague, a meeting of the university was held on the 28th of May, 1403, and forty-five propositions ascribed to Wicklif were laid before that body for examination. Here, for the first time, it came to an open and violent struggle between the Bohemian and the German party. The representatives of the former in part defended the propositions complained of, and partly they maintained that they were not taught in the sense ascribed to them. In this assembly, one of the warm advocates of Wicklif's cause in Bohemia, Master Nicholas of Leitomysl,

declared that these articles had been falsified by a certain Master Hübner, who more richly deserved to be burned than the two poor fellows who had been burned for counterfeiting saffron (an herb much sought for and used in those times). Huss himself declared at this time, as ever afterwards, that he could not agree to the unconditional condemnation of those propositions, though neither was he disposed to defend them all; for many of them had been interpolated by that Master Hübner. He could not join in any such condemnation, lest he should bring on himself the woes denounced on such as called evil good, and good evil.[1]

Also the teacher of Huss, Stanislaus of Znaim, stood forth at this time as a defender of the forty-five propositions; and Huss notices him as the first who took up the word in defence.[2] Still by the vast majority of votes on the side of the German nation, the condemnation of the forty-five articles was carried through. According to the then arrangements of the University of Prague, the Germans, who kept firmly united, would, in all public meetings, of course obtain the victory. The votes were taken by nations; and the University of Prague was divided into four nations. One was the Bohemian; the three others, Bavarian, Saxon, and Polish, of which latter, half were Germans, namely Silesians. Accordingly the Bohemians, who were scarcely one to three, must always succumb. Every victory which the German party won in this way, could only serve to augment the bitter feeling of hostility between the two nations, and between the Wicklifite and anti-Wicklifite parties. The defenders of the writings and doctrines of Wicklif, however, allowed themselves the less to be disturbed by the condemnation pronounced at this convocation, as they had not in fact acknowledged all those propositions to be propositions really laid down by Wicklif. By this condemnation, therefore, nothing or what amounted to nothing had been accomplished; and the opponents of Wicklif's cause were obliged to look round them and conjure up sharper mea-

1 From Huss's remarks in the trial above mentioned. Stud. u. Krit. 1837, i. s. 132.

2 Huss says of him: Reminisceretur, quomodo primus fuit ad defendendum, ne articuli, quos ipse dicit erroneos, damnarentur. Imo et arguebat audacter in congregatione universitatis. Resp. ad scripta Mag. Stan. de Znoyma. Hus opp. i. pag. 288.

sures. Already Bohemian prelates themselves complained at the court of Rome, that Wicklif's heresies had spread even to that spot,[1] and in the year 1405, Pope Innocent VII. was moved thereby to put forth a bull addressed to archbishop Zbynek, calling upon him to suppress and punish the Wicklifite heresies then spreading in Bohemia. The archbishop complied with this call, and at a synod held in Prague, in the year 1406, published an ordinance, threatening ecclesiastical penalties against those who presumed to teach the doctrines of Wicklif.[2] At the same time he enacted, in the same year, a law for the maintenance of the doctrine of transubstantiation, directing all preachers within his diocese to teach, on Corpus-Christi day and on all other days, the doctrine that, after the words of consecration, the substance of the bread and wine were no longer present, but only body and blood of Christ. The name of Wicklif, however, was not here mentioned.[3] This of course could not affect Huss, as he had never declared himself opposed to the doctrine of transubstantiation. In the next place, it was brought about by the measures of the archbishop that, as the three other nations of the University of Prague had always pronounced against the opinions of Wicklif, and therefore in all further measures against them, the only question was with regard to the Bohemian nation, among whom alone these opinions found defenders, the members of this body held, in the year 1408, a great convocation, in which the condemnation of those forty-five propositions was again proposed. But as the unconditional condemnation of them could not, on account of the resistance of the party of Huss, be carried through, such a qualified one was passed as nobody could find fault with, because it was left open to each to explain the propositions in his own sense. It was decreed namely, that no one should presume to maintain

1 See the words from the Chronicles of Prague University, in Palacky iii. 1 s. 213: Innocentius papa VII. instigavit et monuit Zbynkonem archiepiscopum Pragensem, ut sit diligens et sollicitus ad errores Wiclef et haereses exstirpandas. Hanc monitionem praelati procuraverunt.

2 Item anno 1406, D. Zbynko archiepiscopus Prag. edidit statutum, et eodem anno in synodo publice mandavit, quod quicunque praedicaret, assereret vel disputaret errorres Wiclef, in certas ibidem nominatas incideret poenas. Chron. univers. Prag. Palacky p. 214.

3 See the ordinance in a paper by the abbot Stephen of Dola, in the diocese of Olmutz, composed in 1408; Medulla tritici seu Anti-Wickleffus, published by Pez, Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus tom. iv., pars 2 pag. 158.

any one of those forty-five propositions, in their heretical, erroneous, or scandalous sense.[1] Men were not satisfied, therefore, with this measure, by which the desired end could, in no way, be attained. While hitherto every graduate had liberty to read lectures at the University of Prague on any book of a teacher of the Universities of Prague, Paris, or Oxford;[2] and this permission had given occasion for the reading of lectures upon many of Wicklif's writings in Prague, and was taken advantage of to spread more widely the enthusiasm for him and for his doctrines; the liberty was now restricted, on this particular side. An ordinance was passed that, for the future, no bachelor should hold public lectures on any one of the three tracts of Wicklif, entitled the Dialogue, the Trialogue, and the *De Eucharistia;* and no person should make any proposition relating to Wicklif's books and doctrines, a subject of public disputation.[3] Neither does this prohibition, therefore, extend to all Wicklif's writings, but only to those in which he either had set forth his doctrine of the holy supper, or the whole of his theological system.

Up to this time, the good understanding between Huss and the archbishop had not been disturbed, in any open manner. Zbynek could not, as yet, have withdrawn from him his confidence; he must still have highly appreciated his zeal for the reform of the Church, and for the removal of abuses; for he chose him, as late as the year 1407, to deliver the exhortatory discourse before his clergy assembled at a synod of the diocese. We recognise in it those principles with regard to the destination of the clergy, which Huss entertained in common with Matthias of Janow and Wicklif. They were the principles which, in theory and practice, distinguished the clergy who were friendly to reform, and who already bore, in Bohemia, the names *clerus*

1 Quatenus nemo quemquam illorum, articulorum xlv. audeat tenere, docere vel defendere in sensibus eoram haereticis, aut erroneis, aut scandalosis. Palacky i. c. d. p. 222.

2 Quivis magistrorum poterit super quolibet libro de facultate artium proprie dicta dare, per se vel per alium idoneum pronuntiando; poterit quoque scripta aliorum et dicta per se aut per alium pronuntiare, dummodo sint ab aliquo vel aliquibus famoso vel famosis de universitate Pragensi, Parisiensi vel Oxoniensi magistro vel magistris compilata, et dummodo ista antea fideliter correxerit, et pronuntiatorem assumserit idoneum et valentem. Palacky, p. 188.

3 Palacky, iii. 1 p. 222.

evangelicus and *pauperes sacerdotes Christi*.[1] He had chosen for his text the passage in Ephesians vi. 14, and employed these words for the purpose of bringing the clergy to a consciousness of their vocation, as opposed to the then existing worldliness of the clergy in Bohemia. For the purpose of bringing clearly to view the destination of the clergy, he explains the grounds of the division of Christendom into three orders, which ever lay at bottom of his proposal for the reform of the entire social state, viz., the clergy, the secular nobility, who should make their power subservient to the promotion of the law of Christ, and the rest of the people standing in obedience to the two parts, as their leaders in things spiritual and secular. The clergy ought to take the lead of all others in following Christ under the form of a servant, in meekness, humility, purity, and poverty. Huss was still entangled in the distinction made between the *consilia evangelica* and the *praecepta*, above which Matthias of Janow had, as we have earlier seen, already risen in recognizing the equal Christian vocation of all men. Huss regarded it as the calling of the clergy to exhibit to all, even in the observance of the "evangelical councils," a pattern of Christian perfection. Hence he must have held to the necessity of celibacy in the clergy. The clergy ought literally to fulfil the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount; therefore never to give an oath; their yea and nay ought to be sufficient. They ought literally to realize what Christ had said in the Sermon on the Mount, on loving our enemies, on bearing wrongs. The thriving of Christian life in all others must therefore be conditioned on the fact that the clergy let their light shine before others, in the literal copying after Christ. It was in the falling away of the clergy from this, their true destination, that Huss, as he here declares, found the cause of the corruptions in the rest of Christendom, the contemplation of which filled his soul, more and more every day, with that heart sorrow which formed one of the strong features of his character. He says in this regard, contemplating Christians as soldiers of Christ, and the clergy as those who ought to take the foremost position in the

1 Paletz was disposed afterwards to find something arrogant in the claim, which seemed to be implied in these appellations, quod in doctrina et in scriptis se audent clerum evangelicum nominare. Hus resp. ad scr. Paletz; opera i., pag. 260.

marshalled host; it is clearly evident that the clergy should lead the order of battle in the spiritual conflict. But if they are unfit for the contest, the victory is seldom or never won; since they, betaking themselves to flight, or struck down and put into confusion, fill the next ranks of the army with despair or irresolution. Now if the clergy are struck down or slain, this will hinder the rest of the army from conquering the enemy; but if they treacherously enter into a league with the enemy, they will prepare the way for them to vanquish, more easily and treacherously, the army of our Lord Jesus Christ. For this is the reason why, in our days, the Christian army is overcome by the flesh, the world, the devil, and pagans."[1] As Huss considered it a part of the clerical calling to set the example of following Christ, and regarded the clergy, as "vicars of Christ," in this sense, so when they exhibited the opposite of this in their lives, he stigmatizes them as antichrist; and accordingly he here expresses, before the archbishop and *clerus*, the view which, from the time of Militz, had been transmitted to all the representatives of this reform tendency, and which in the development of the consequences proceeding therefrom, would be directed against the whole hierarchical fabric, that the true antichrist was already present in the corrupt clergy, whose life and doctrine stood in mutual contradiction. He also attacks expressly, in this discourse, the countenance given to superstition. "Many"—says he—"stand waiting for gifts by letters of fraternities,[2] by far-sought indulgences, by fictitious relics, by painted images of saints."[3]

Still the measures which the archbishop, by his interest to support the church, and by the injunction received from Rome, was

1 Hus opp. ii. pag. 32.

2 Documents whereby certain spiritual societies adopted others into the community of their merits. Against abuses of this sort, and the confidence placed in them, Matthias of Janow had often spoken. Attacking these epistolae fraternitatum was reckoned also among the peculiarities of Wicklifitism, as we may see from what the abbot Stephen of Dola says about it in the paper cited above. He tries to defend them as special testimonies of love to persons who had conferred peculiar favours: Si quas autem tradimus humiliter et devote pro deo petentibus societatis peculiaris in Christo literas, nihil aliud agitur, ubi recta intentio custoditur, nisi ut salvis communibus ecclesiae praecibus, aliquid specialis beneficii specialibus benefactoribus faciamus pro talibus in vita et in morte pariter. L. c. pag. 240.

3 Multi enim stant quaerentes munera per fraternitatum literas, per exquisitas indulgentias, per fictas reliquias et per imagines coloratas. Pag. 36.

impelled to take to prevent the spread of Wicklifitism, would necessarily bring about by degrees a change in the relations which had subsisted between Zbynek and Huss. The archbishop's official, John of Kebel, presided over a judicial examination instituted against several clergymen accused of Wicklifite errors: Nicholas of Welenowitz, preacher at the church of the Holy Spirit in Prague, Master Matthias Pater of Knin, a certain bachelor Sigmund of Jistebnitz, and others. One of these, Nicholas of Welenowitz, commonly called Abraham, deserves special notice. He is said to have asserted that laymen as well as priests might be allowed to preach the gospel.[1] This is an important fact to us, as an indication of the religious bent of spirit which had passed over from Matthias of Janow to the party of Huss,—the tendency which once more brought up to notice the universal priesthood of Christians. It is also a circumstance marking the character of these clergymen, that at his trial he declined swearing except by the living God, that he would not swear by the crucifix, the gospels, or the saints, because no oath could be taken on things created. Huss took part with the man in reference to this point, honouring the conscientiousness which refused to transfer to any created thing the honour due to God alone. He opposed to those judges the authority of St Chrysostom.[2] In vain was the intercession of Huss. He was thrown into prison, and after some days released, but banished from the diocese. Huss, in a letter, vehemently reproached the archbishop on account of this proceeding. "What is this! that men stained with innocent blood, men guilty of every crime, shall be found walking abroad almost

1 From the Acts of the Consistory of Prague, of the year 1408, cited by Palacky iii. 1. p. 223, Note 287.

2 We take this from the Trial of Huss, in the year 1414, a document of which much use has been made already. The words of Huss are: Istud dixi coram inquisitoribus Magistro Mauricio et Jaroslao episcopo, et coram vicario in spiritualibus, quando vexabant sacerdotem Abraham, dicentes coram me, quod noluisset jurare. Ad quem dixi coram ipsis: Non vis tu jurare? Qui respondit: Juravi ipsis per deum vivum, quod volo veritatem dicere, et ipsi urgebant me, ut jurarem supra evangelium et imaginem crucifixi. Quibus ego Joannes Huss dixi, quod sanctus Jo. Chrysostomus nos vocat stultos, qui expetunt juramentum super creatura, quasi majus sit jurare per creaturam, quam per deum. Et statim vicarius in spiritualibus nomine Bibel dixit furiose: Ha Magister, vos venistis huc ad audiendum, et non arguendum. Cui dixi: Ecce vos istum sacerdotem condemnare, dicentes eum tenere errorem Waldensium, et ipse juravit vobis per deum, estne hoc justum? Et alia multa loquebar iis. See Stud. u. Krit. l. c. page 139 and 140.

with impunity; while humble priests, who spend all their efforts to destroy sin, who fulfil their duties under your church guidance, in a good temper, never follow avarice, but give themselves for nothing to God's service and the proclamation of his word, are cast into dungeons as heretics, and must suffer banishment for preaching the gospel?"[1] Here, for the first time, the thing came out openly which we have said was inevitable, that although the archbishop, at the beginning, countenanced the reform tendency in Huss, yet the opposite character of their principles and of their tempers, must lead to a rupture between them as soon as the activity of Huss as a reformer passed beyond a certain limit. And when the first impulse had been given, he could not fail to be carried still farther, by the movements in this period of a great crisis of the church. A document which bears testimony to the extreme excitement between the Wicklifite party in Bohemia and the representatives of the old hierarchical system in its whole extent, is a work composed in these times, about the year 1408, by the abbot of the convent of Dola, in the diocese of Olmutz; the object of which was to guard against and to refute the Wicklifite heresies. Dola was a man by no means disposed to defend the abuses of simony and the bad conduct of the clergy and monks. He complains of it as a grievance, that important men in Bohemia, a country hitherto exempt from all heresies, had contributed to bring their nation into bad repute with foreigners, particularly with the Germans; that they openly and secretly disseminated the Wicklifite doctrines;[2] that the writings of Wicklif were scattered over the whole world.[3] He describes the party as one that boasted of having first made familiar the understanding of the Scriptures, and taken pains to have the gospel preached everywhere. He quotes from their own lips the words: "We preach; we proclaim the word of

1 Qualiter hoc est, quod incestuosi et varie criminosi absque rigo correctionis— incedunt libere, sacerdotes autem humiles, spinas peccati evellentes, officium Vestri implentes regiminis ex bono affectu, non sequentes avaritiam, sed gratis Pro deo se offerentes ad evangelisationis laborem, tanquam haeretici manicipantur carceribus, et exilium propter evangelisationem ipsius evangelii patiuntur? caet. Palacky, iii. 1 p. 223, Note 288.

2 Stephanus Dolanus Antiwikleffus, by Pez, thesaur. tom. vi. pars 2 pag. 184.

3 Quae in orbe terrarum hinc inde discurrunt scripta per chartulas. Ibid. pag. 213.

God; we guide the people.[1] He gives us to understand that they attacked all others as ignorant men (no doubt in reference to their knowledge of the Scripture); that they were opponents of the monks, of the conventual clergy; as the latter, in fact, were the most decidedly opposed to the more liberal Christian tendency.[2] Already, too, he found it necessary to defend the doctrine of indulgences against the objections of this party.[3] The author of this work attacks no individual name; he does not even mention that of Huss, whom he undoubtedly had in his eye in speaking of "men who seemed to be of some consequence."[4] But at this time the Wicklifites, so-called, would be treated with more forbearance, as the opposition within the Bohemian party itself, at the University of Prague, had not as yet broken out; and the abbot himself had, earlier, stood on friendly terms with Huss, and describes him as a man formerly inclined to support the church, and likeminded with himself.[5]

But although such excitement existed between the two parties, yet archbishop Zbynek thought that enough had been done on his part for the suppression of the Wicklifite heresy. He may not have been, himself, so very zealous in this matter. He had his reasons for exercising forbearance towards the party of Huss, which had important adherents in all ranks of society. Violent steps might, in the present times of fermentation, lead to fearful commotions; and King Wenceslaus had not, since the accession of Pope Boniface IX., stood on the best terms with the Roman court, as the latter had failed to afford him the desired assistance in his struggle with Rupert for the imperial dignity. His openly avowed breach with the court of Rome would be favourable to

1 Ibid. pag. 209.

2 Non sumus, inquiunt, sicut caeteri hominum, idiotae et claustrales. Ibid.

3 Ibid. pag. 214.

4 Qui videntur esse aliquid.

5 Tu vero homo olim unanimis, qui simul mecum dulces capiebas cibos, magnificasti super me supplantationem, in his Antihussus, Pez thes. tom. iv. pars. 2, pag. 389. Cochlæus cites this passage and much other matter from this book in his work Historiae Hussitarum lib. i. pag. 39; but he names the author Stephen Paletz. Doubtless he was led to confound him with Stephen Paletz, on account of his having the same Christian name, Stephen, and because the abbot in the place cited, where Cochlæus instead of *simul* reads *semel*, which would give a totally different sense at variance with the context, speaks of himself as an old friend of Huss; which confusion was already noticed by the Benedictine Pez, the editor of the writings of this abbot.

the reform party in Bohemia; and archbishop Zbynek could not reckon on the king's support in carrying out his measures against Wicklifitism. As it might be very prejudicial to the king's interests in relation to German affairs, that suspicions should be raised against the Bohemians by the spread of reports importing that they were inclined to the Wicklifite heresy, he was the more urgent with the archbishop to set on foot an investigation which should vindicate the good character of the Bohemians. In July of the year 1408, Zbynek declared, at a diocesan synod held at Prague, that it had been found, after investigation, that no Wicklifite heresy existed at present in Bohemia.[1] At the same time, however, he ordered that the writings of Wicklif should be delivered up,—an order which ended in mere words, the bishop not having the power, and perhaps at that time not even a serious intention, of actually carrying out so radical a measure.

Up to to this time, the Bohemians at the University of Prague were still united together, by a common national interest, against the predominance of the Germans. The party favourable to reform would be the most desirous to overthrow this preponderance, the Germans being, on account of their philosophical and theological opinions, the fiercest opponents of the new theological tendency; and by their co-operation, as had been shown at the convocation assembled to condemn the forty-five articles of Wicklif, all measures directed against this tendency might easily be carried through. Combined, in the case of Huss and Jerome, with the religious interest, was that of patriotism; and on this side they might count on receiving the support of many who did not agree with them in religious and doctrinal matters. Huss, the confessor of Queen Sophia, could for this reason exercise a greater influence at court. His friend Jerome moved in the most respectable circles. They were supported, in this cause, by the most influential of the nobility. Add to this that King Wenceslaus had a strong political motive, connected with his politico-ecclesiastical plans, for favouring the Bohemian more than the German

1 See what Palacky (iii. 1 p. 224), remarks, on the authority of certain MS. records, and the words of the Jurist, Master Jensenitz, in his Repetitio pro defensione causae Joann. Hus: Cum in regno Boëmiae nullus fidei erroneus vel haereticus hujusque sit compertus vel convictus, prout pronunciatio principum et baronum inter dominum Sbynconem piae memoriae archiepisopum olim Pragensem et partem adversam approbat. Huss opp. i. fol. 832, 2.

party in the university. Meantime took place the renunciation of both the rival popes, by the great majority of the cardinals, and the proclamation of the council of Pisa. The king, who had been urged by France, and had separated from Gregory XII., was disposed to embrace the cause of the council. In this view, he might expect more support from the party in favour of reform, than from the Germans who were devoted to the cause of papal despotism. Thus he was induced to put forth an edict, whereby a change was made in the relation of votes at the University of Prague, three being given to the Bohemians, while only one was allowed to the foreigners. Teachers and students of the German nation carried into effect, in the month of September, a resolution which they had bound themselves, under the most sacred oaths, to execute in case the king would give no heed to their remonstrances, and forsook Prague in vast numbers. The number who left, it seems, cannot be exactly estimated. They who reckon highest, estimate it at 44,000; the lowest estimate is 5,000.[1] Only 2,000 students are said to have been left in Prague.

This was an event which, in its consequences, had the most important influence on the development of the contest, which is now the subject of our contemplation. The Bohemian party at the university had now gained decidedly the ascendency, as was soon made evident by the choice of Huss as rector of the university. But it turned out here as it usually does in political, ecclesiastical, and religious affairs, with combinations formed of conflicting elements, and held together only by the bond of a common opposition. The national interest had thus far brought into union with Huss a set of men, who were unlike him in spirit and temper, and were only not conscious as yet of the opposition really existing between them. A crisis must now arrive, which would operate to separate those who valued the interests of Christianity and reform above all things else, from those who were not disposed in any case to renounce the dominant church tendency. The decisive events which transpired in this stormy period must soon bring about the dissolution of such a union, which was no longer held together by the interest of a common

1 See the dissertation of J. Th. Held: "Illustratio rerum anno 1409 in universitate Pragena gestarum," and the essays of Pelzel on the history of the Emperor Wenceslaus, and Palacky, l. c.

opposition; and men who had fought side by side must be led to fight against each other. Men who had been *friends* must become the most violent *enemies*. Amongst those who left the university were to be found eminent scholars who obtained important situations abroad. This emigration was the occasion of the founding of the new university at Leipsic. And the most injurious reports were now circulated abroad respecting the heresies of the party of Huss. All who were determined to maintain the old church system, not merely the friends of the papal absolutism of the middle age, but also those disposed to favour reform, the adherents of the Parisian theology, believed they saw a dangerous revolution, threatening the overthrow of all ecclesiastical order, breaking forth from Bohemia, and were therefore of the opinion that every effort should be made to avert this danger. The city of Prague suffered a great loss by this emigration. Even commerce felt the blow; as many merchants had sent their sons to Prague with a view to push their business in that city, and these young men had in part got themselves matriculated in order to enjoy the privileges of the university. An odious light was cast upon Jerome and Huss as the authors of the mischief; and this was marked as one of the ruinous effects of religious schism. Jerome of Prague must therefore defend himself and his friend against the charges brought against them on this side also, at the council of Constance; and he sets forth the motives of patriotism, which had induced them to obtain this decree from King Wenceslaus. After having given an account of the ascendency which the Germans had gained ever after the foundation of the University of Prague, he said, that when he and Huss and other nobles, in Bohemia, perceived that the whole effect of all this would be to exterminate the Bohemian language, they had gone to the king; and he had persuaded his friend Huss, in his Bohemian sermons, to make the people take notice that they ought no longer to tolerate such a thing, nor suffer themselves to be so treated by the Germans; and so, with the help of the Bohemian nobility and others of their countrymen, they had finally carried the thing through.[1] In

1 Ipse vero Hieronymus videns hoc, una cum Mag. Joann. Hus iverunt ad regem Bohemiae, concludentes, quod talia essent res mali exempli et tenderent in destructionem linguae Bohemicalis. Et persuasit Mag. Joann. Hus, quod in sermonibus

like manner Huss was accused, as we find it laid to his charge in his last trial in Prague, in the year 1414, of having driven the German students from the university. But he replied; the German students were driven away by nobody. Their own oath alone drove them away; they pledged themselves on penalty of excommunication for perjury, the forfeiture of their honour, and a pecuniary mulct of 60 groats, that not one of them would remain at the university, if they did not have the right of three votes. According to the law of God, and by natural right, the Bohemians ought to have the first claim to offices within the Bohemian realm; just as the French have in France, and the Germans in their countries. Of what sort of use would it be for a Bohemian parish priest or bishop to settle down in Germany, if he were not familiar with the German tongue, and therefore had about the same power over his flock as a dumb dog which could not bark? "The same power would a German have among us Bohemians. Knowing, therefore, that this is contrary to the law of God and natural right, I say that it is not allowable."[1]

Meantime, King Wenceslaus, who had never been a friend of the hierarchy, became daily more involved in controversy with the archbishop and the clergy. The influence of this was, that he promoted thereby, without intending it, the movements of reform, besides contributing on the one hand to strengthen the party of Huss, and, on the other, to draw upon him still more numerous and more dangerous enemies. The archbishop and clergy would not abandon Pope Gregory XII., whose obedience the king had renounced, nor recognize the general council assembled at Pisa, whose cause Wenceslaus sought to promote. The king was for carrying out his will in his own states. He met with fierce resistance from the clergy; many refused to continue divine worship. Violent attacks were made on the archbishop and the clergy by the king and his favourites, who, partly as the king's instruments, partly from private grudges, eagerly sought to humble the prelates. Many betook themselves to flight; their

Bohemicalibus deberet inducere populum Bohemicalem, quod tali amplius, sustinere non deberent, quod ita tractarentur per Teutonicos. Jerome, in his last hearing at Constance. See V. d. Hardt, acta concilii Constantiensis tom. iv. pars 2, pag. 758.

[1] Depos. test. in the Stud. u. Krit. a. a. O. p. 131.

goods were confiscated. The king, too, was probably inclined to indulge in acts of arbitrary self-will. Huss now considered it to be his duty to declare himself in favour of the cause of the council in his sermons, and to promote it in every way, as there was far more reason to expect something might be done for the reform of the church by the council than by either of the popes. By so doing he would gain the favour of the king, but so much the more draw upon himself the enmity of the archbishop and the clergy; and this was attended with important consequences on the later events. Huss himself points to this in his letter hereafter to be noticed to the college of Cardinals in Rome, as the prime cause of the violent rupture between him and the archbishop. He says, the grievous oppressions which he was compelled to bear, originated in the fact, that at the time of the renunciation of Pope Gregory XII., he had strongly recommended and constantly preached to all the nobles, princes, and lords, to the clergy and the people, the duty of taking part with the general council for restoring unity to the church. Hence the archbishop Zbynek had forbidden to all masters of the university who sided with the college of cardinals, and particularly to himself, by a public notice posted on the churches, the exercise of all priestly functions within his diocese.[1] In like manner Huss expressed himself, on this subject, at the council of Constance. He was accused, namely, of having sowed discord and schism between the spiritual and secular powers; hence had arisen the persecution of the bishop and the clergy, and the plundering of their goods. To this Huss replied: Nothing of the kind had happened through any fault of his. The schism between church and state had fallen out earlier, and it had arisen in this way: King Wenceslaus had been induced to abandon Pope Gregory XII., who favoured Duke Rupert of Bavaria in the competition for the imperial dignity, and to apply to the college of cardinals, which held out to him the hope of obtaining the vote of the pope then to be elected. Now as archbishop Zbynek and the clergy opposed the king in this step, and many suspended divine worship and left Prague, and in fact were followed by the archbishop himself, the king had easily granted that the goods of those who had fled to avoid being compelled to

[1] Huss opp. 1 fol. 93.

side with the king, should be taken from them.[1] By these commotions Huss was led, in setting forth the necessity of a reformation of the church to his numerous hearers in Bethlehem chapel, to pourtray the corruption of the clergy in all its parts in dark colours, indeed, but certainly not exceeding the truth. For this he had often been reproached, both at that time and more recently. While the clergy heard him with pleasure when he fearlessly attacked the reigning vices among other classes of men, they could no longer tolerate him when he attacked their own. They laid a complaint against him before the king; but the king, who was not displeased with what he had done, replied to them: When Huss preached sharp discourses against the princes and lords, they had complacently looked on; now their turn had come, and they must make the best of it. Upon this was founded the charge that Huss had stirred up the laity to rebellion against the clergy. On the occasion of his trial at Prague, in the year 1414, he was forced to defend himself against this charge; and he said: "I hope that, by the grace of God, I have never preached in an unbecoming manner. Against the vices of the clergy I have undoubtedly preached; and I hope that I shall preach against them before the council (of Constance); not in any extravagant and irregular way, nor so as to show any disposition to injure their good name, but so as to restore their good name, and to give them occasion for correcting their faults. For he who seeks to remove the vices in his neighbours, from good motives, seeks most effectually to restore their good name. O, how much would it conduce to the good name of every one, if, whenever he heard his vices rebuked in a sermon, he would renounce them, and afterwards, by a good life, secure to himself the praise of God and all holy men." When he was accused of drawing away, by his sermons, the laity of other churches from their parish priests and leading them to disobey those priests, he replied, that he had never, in any way, enticed subjects from a holy obedience to their superiors, but from unlawful obedience; he had taught that they should not follow those set over them and parish priests in doing that which is wrong.[2] It was cast as

1 See Hardt tom. iv., pars 2, pag. 311 et 312.
2 See Stud. u. Krit. a. a. O. p. 143.

a special reproach upon Huss, as it had already been before upon Matthias of Janow,[1] that he openly attacked, before the people, in the Bohemian tongue, the vices of the clergy. In reference to this, Cardinal d'Ailly afterwards said to him, at the council of Constance, "Certainly thou hast not observed a just moderation in thy sermons and writings. Oughtest thou not to have adapted thy sermons to the particular needs of thy hearers? For what was the necessity or advantage of preaching before the people against cardinals, when no cardinal was present? Such things should rather be said in their presence, than to their injury before the laity." To this Huss replied: "Priests and other learned men were present to hear my sermons,[2] and what I said was on their account, and for the purpose of warning them."[3] Huss, at some later period, composed a tract, in vindication of himself against the charge of having done wrong in openly attacking the vices of the clergy in his sermons, and pointed out the reasons which had led him to do so. He states, in particular, the following good ends, which such discourses might subserve: first, it might be of advantage to the clergy themselves, that they should be made ashamed of their faults and led to repentance; secondly, that the worth of good clergymen would shine brighter by the contrast. Thirdly, that good clergymen would, by comparison with the bad, gain so much the more the love of the people, and bad ones fall so much the more into contempt. Fourthly, that the good clergy and laity thus learned to avoid the bad, as mangy sheep and wolves. And he applies here the words of Christ on the final separation (Matt. xiii. 41) which, after the manner of Matthias of Janow,[4] he understands as referring to heralds or preachers, designated as Christ's angels, sent forth in the last times for the purpose of separating the good from the bad. Fifthly, that the simple laity might not imitate those wolves in their life and conduct. Sixthly, that the sinful laity might be stript of every excuse; since it was their wont to say, The priests preach against our unchastity and other vices,

1 See above p. 265.

2 What Huss here says is confirmed by the words of the abbot of Dola in his Dialogues volatilis adv. Hussum: Auditorum multorum millium diversi status et generis supputatio. Pez thesaur. tom. iv. pars 2, pag. 462.

3 Quia sermonibus meis sacerdotes et alii docti viri interfuerunt, illorum causa haec a me dicta sunt, ut sibi caverent. See Hardt tom. iv., pars 2, pag. 317.

4 See above, p. 266.

and say nothing of their own unchastity and their own vices. Either this is no sin, or they are for monopolizing it to themselves. And since it was their wont to say, The priests behold the mote in our eyes, but not the beam in their own; let them first cast out the beam in their own eyes, and then tell us that we should cast out the mote from ours; and since, again, it was their wont to say, Why dost thou reprove me?—the priests do the same; why dost thou not reprove them? Is it perchance no sin in their case? Next, because if the prelate be a bad man, perhaps an antichrist, and if, perhaps, on account of his wickedness, the people will not obey him even in what is right; the preacher is bound to call upon them to act according to the example of Christ; to follow the precepts which such lay down, but not imitate their actions (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3, and 1 Pet. ii. 18). Finally, because the students, when they listen with the people to sermons attacking the vices of the clergy, seek to avoid such, and to prepare themselves, in a better way, for their future calling; or if they are conscious of being guilty of still greater sins, which would be incompatible with their undertaking so sacred a vocation, they are moved to forsake them betimes.[1] In a later performance Huss appeals to the maxim that sin can at most hurt a good man only when it is not known to be sin; when exposed it is rendered harmless.[2] Another contemporary, the Bohemian theologian Andrew of Broda, says, to be sure, in a writing addressed to Huss, that he was not persecuted expressly because he attacked the vices of the clergy; for the same thing had been done already, before him, by John Militz, Conrad of Waldhausen, and John Stekna.[3] But it is evident, from our preceding narrative, that the two first-named individuals did actually draw down upon themselves persecution by their castigatory sermons against the clergy. It may be gathered from the words of Matthias of Janow, cited on a former page, how certainly such cas-

1 See the tract de arguendo clero pro concione. Hus opp. i. fol. 150, 2 sq.

2 Nulla autem res sic exterminat bonum, quemadmodum simulatum bonum. Nam manifestum malum tamquam malum fugitur et cavetur. Malum autem sub specie boni celatum, dum non cognoscitur, nec cavetur, sed etiam quasi benum suscipitur et non conjunctum est bono, id est Christo, ideo exterminat bonum Responsio ad scriptum octo doctorum, Opp. i., fol. 305, 2.

3 Andrew of Broda, in his Responsio to the epistola, qua a Joann. Hus tentatus fuerat, ut vel in partem ejus transiret, vel saltem non obsisteret: Nam et ab antiquis temporibus Millicius, Conradus, Sczekna et alii quam plurimi contra clericos praedicaverunt. See Cochlaeus, hist. Huss. lib. i., pag. 42.

tigatory preachers exposed themselves to persecutions and to defamation as heretics; and it lay in the very nature of the case that, as the excited feelings between the two parties, that of the dominant clergy and of the friends of reform, increased in intensity, so the persecutions against the castigatory preachers would increase in violence. Now as it concerns Huss, his connection with Wicklifitism, and the complication of his cause with many other matters which we have pointed out, contributed no doubt to aggravate his case. And as he cultivated the growth of that which had been sown by his predecessors, so he was under the necessity also of reaping, in the bad a well as the good sense, what they had but sown.

The clergy of Prague, who had already, near the end of the year 1408, entered a complaint against Huss before the archbishop, renewed their complaint in still stronger terms during the year in which, for the reasons already mentioned, the breach grew more violent. The charges which they brought against Huss were as follows: that he stirred up the people against the clergy, the Bohemians against the Germans; preached disrespect to the church, and disregard to her power of punishing; styled Rome the seat of antichrist, and declared every clergyman who demanded a fee for distributing the sacrament a heretic; that he openly praised Wicklif, and had expressed the wish that his soul might finally arrive where Wicklif's soul was.[1] In reference to the charge relating to his opinion of Wicklif, Huss in his trial at Prague, in the year 1414, remarked: "I say, and have said, that Wicklif was, as I hope, a good Christian; and I hope he is in the kingdom of heaven; and so too have I expressed myself in my sermons. Hence I hope also to-day; though I never affirmed it as a fact, that Wicklif belonged to the number of the saved; because I do not choose to condemn any man, respecting whom I have no testimony of Scripture and no revelation, no spiritual knowledge, that he belongs to the number of the reprobate; for our Saviour says, Judge not, that ye be not judged."[2]

On the presentation of these complaints, archbishop Zbynek charged his inquisitor, Master Mauritius of Prague, to inquire into them, and at the same time to examine by virtue of what

1 Palacky iii. 1, p. 246.
2 Depos. test. 1. c. p. 129 and 130.

authority it was that sermons and divine worship were held in Bethelehem chapel. We perceive, here, already a wish in the archbishop to find some reason for putting a stop to those labours of Huss in Bethlehem chapel which exerted so great an influence on the people. It is much to be questioned whether Huss, under the existing circumstances, when the bonds of the diocese were relaxed by discordant opinions respecting the recognition of the council of Pisa, would have acknowledged the competency of that spiritual court. He himself, however, addressed to Rome a complaint against the archbishop, and the latter was cited to Rome on the 14th of December of the year 1409. Yet in the meanwhile the more general commotions in the church brought about a change in the whole situation of the affair.

After the council of Pisa had successfully asserted itself as the supreme tribunal of the church, the archbishop dared no longer to resist. He acknowledged Alexander V., the pope appointed by the council. But when the cause of the council had made good its way through Bohemia, Huss received no thanks for what he had done in the struggle with the dominant church party for the furtherance of the cause of the council. Zbynek was able to obtain more from the pope for giving up his opposition. His complaints, laid before the latter, respecting the dissemination of the Wicklifite heresy in these districts, met with the more ready acceptance because of his submission; and Alexander V. was induced by the archbishop to put forth, soon afterwards and as early as December of the year 1409, a bull in which he declares he had heard that the heresies of Wicklif, and especially his denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation, was spreading far and wide in Bohemia. He called upon the archbishop to employ vigorous measures for the suppression of these heresies. He should cause all the writings of Wicklif to be delivered up into his hands, appoint a committee of four doctors of theology and two doctors of canon law to examine the same, and proceed in conformity with the judgment they should give. All clergymen who refused to deliver up those writings, or who should defend Wicklifite heresies, he should cause to be arrested and deprived of their benefices, and in case of necessity the aid of the secular power should be called in. As private chapels served to spread errors among the people, sermons for the future should

be preached, in Bohemia, only in cathedrals, parish and conventual churches, and prohibited in all *private churches*.[1] This papal bull did not arrive in Bohemia until ten weeks after it had been put forth, and was proclaimed on the 9th of March 1410. It was the first in the series of great convulsions, which the Bohemian Church was destined henceforth to suffer, the beginning of the great commotions in the midst of which Huss was borne on, from one step in advance to another. Zbynek had probably been the more confident that by means of this expression of the supreme authority of the Church he should be able to crush the party at a blow, because King Wenceslaus had not only recognized Alexander V. as a pope elected by the council favoured by himself, but in addition to this had, in earlier times, been on terms of personal friendship with the new pope. For the latter, when Cardinal Villargi, had decidedly supported the cause of the king in his competition for the imperial dignity; and it might therefore be expected that the king would be ready to evince his gratitude by obedience to all his ordinances. But the bull, which bore evidence on its face of being a work of Zbynek, aimed particularly against Huss and his friends, was received with great indignation by important men in Bohemia and about the king's person. In the present excited state of feeling, men easily foresaw that great disturbances must necessarily arise if the archbishop carried the bull into execution. The cause of Huss was espoused by the most eminent of the nobility around the person of the king.[2] By their influence the king's prejudices were excited against the bull and against Zbynek the author of it. His suspicions may have been aroused against Zbynek as an enemy to the realm, the man who had brought it into the bad odour of heresy, though he himself had, as Huss asserted,

1 For Alexander's bull, see Raynaldi annales ecclesiastic. tom. xvii., pag. 396.

2 His connection with those in power was an odious imputation brought against Huss by the above mentioned abbot of Dola; Et popularis vulgi favor et saeculare brachium praestabat manifestum praesidium. Pez thes. iv. 2, pag. 390. But Huss stood by no means in need of the secular power to promote the spread of his principles; but it was a consequence of the influence of his mind and of his principles on the minds of the people and of the knights, from which everything else resulted as a matter of course; just as in later times Luther acquired, without seeking it, his mighty influence over the minds of the people and the knights, through the power of the truths which he proclaimed. From the respectable knights and barons, however, the influence in Bohemia passed over to the king.

very recently declared it, as the result of an investigation made under the sanction of the assembly in Prague already mentioned, that no Wicklifite heresy existed at present in Bohemia. The bull was declared to be in many ways a garbled and interpolated one, and therefore of no force. Huss himself excited suspicions against it on this ground, and employed at first every lawful means in his power, under the circumstances of those times, to withhold obedience while he showed all respect to the Roman Church. He appealed from the pope *male informato* to the pope *melius informandum*. The archbishop, however, was not to be disturbed by all this. He issued his prohibition against preaching in private chapels, and applying this also to Bethlehem chapel, Huss thought this contrary to the right granted in the foundation-charter; he thought he was secured from harm himself by his appeal; and at all events was determined to act on the principle that it was right to obey God rather than men, and that no man should be induced to desist from a divine vocation by the arbitrary will of an individual. Zbynek issued, moreover, a command that all the writings of Wicklif should be delivered up to him for examination within six days. Huss obeyed this injunction, declaring himself ready (which certainly was honestly meant on his part, and cannot justly be ascribed to any motive of pride) to condemn them himself, whenever an error could be pointed out in them. Zbynek now actually proceeded, after many writings of Wicklif had been delivered up, to appoint a committee of examination in the manner prescribed in the bull; and this committee pronounced sentence of condemnation on a certain number of Wicklif's writings: the Dialogue, the Trialogue, and also (a thing which was afterwards particularly noticed by the friends of Wicklif, and with good reason, and which would cause the whole affair to be regarded in a more unfavourable light) on writings of simply philosophical import, as for example his important work on the reality of general conceptions, and on works containing nothing but mathematical and physical disquisitions, as their titles sufficiently indicated. These books were all to be committed to the flames, and thus put out of the way of doing harm. The very announcement of this sentence produced disturbances. At a convocation of the university, it was resolved to send in a petition to the king, that he would prevent the execution of such a sentence, on account of the

extreme peril to which it would expose the peace of the university and of all Bohemia.[1] The king promised the delegates of the university that he would comply with their request. The archbishop, on hearing of this, hastened to get the start of the king; and on the next day, the 16th of June, repeated the proclamation of the above sentence on the writings of Wicklif. When the king learned of this, he caused the archbishop to be asked, whether it was really his intention to burn the books. Zbynek promised that he would do nothing against Wicklif's writings without the king's consent; and for this reason put off the execution of the sentence. But he was far from intending really to give up the execution of the sentence, in spite of all the remonstrances against such a proceeding, alleging in excuse of his conduct that the king had not *expressly forbidden* him to burn the books. On the 16th of July, 1410, having surrounded his palace with a watch, he actually caused two hundred volumes, among which were not only the writings of Wicklif, but also some of Militz and others, to be burned, without the slightest regard to rights of private property, as was afterwards remembered to his reproach. This step of the archbishop was the signal for great disturbances and violent controversies in Prague. Even blood was spilt. So great a movement in the minds of men could not be put down with force. The attempt to put it down by an act of arbitrary power, would have only led to still greater violence. The burning of the books had no other effect than to expose the archbishop to contempt and ridicule; and it was a great shock to his authority. Ribald and satirical songs, of which he was made the subject, were openly sung in the streets of Prague, to the purport, "the archbishop has yet to learn his A B C; he has caused books to be burned, without knowing what was in them!"[2] King Wenceslaus himself, though no friend of the archbishop, believed it necessary to put some check on these proceedings; and is said to have forbidden, on pain of death, these satirical songs on the archbishop.[3] Two

1 Ne exinde confusio toti regno, domino regi et universitati inferatur. See Pelzel's account of the life of King Winceslaus I. in Urkundsnbuch, No. 220, p. 130.

2 Pelzel Gesch. Wenceslaus Thl. ii. s. 568.

3 The abbot of Dola describes the impression produced by the burning of the books, in the words presently to be cited, but unjustly lays the blame of all not on the caprice and folly of the archbishop, whom he designates as a man of God, but to the mischievous influence of Huss, though the whole was a natural consequence

contemporaries, belonging to the opposite parties, are agreed in stating that by this burning of his books, the enthusiasm for Wicklif was increased rather than diminished. One was Huss's zealous opponent, the abbot Stephen of Dola, who at the same time was blind enough to trace the origin of all the troubles to the disobedience of Huss. This writer cites, from the lips of one of Wicklif's adherents, the following words: "The archbishop has burnt *many* famous writings of Wicklif; yet he has not been able to burn them *all*. For we have still quite a number left; and we are continually searching in all quarters for others to add to this number, and to supply the place of those lost. Let the archbishop again bid us deliver them up to him, and let him see whether we will obey him!"[1] The second is Huss himself, who says: "I call the burning of books a poor business. Such burning never yet removed a single sin from the hearts of men (if he who condemned could not prove anything), but has only destroyed many truths, many beautiful and fine thoughts, and multiplied among the people disturbances, enmities, suspicions, and murders."[2] When now the news of the death of Alexander V., and of the accession to the government of John XXIII., arrived in Prague, Huss followed up his earlier appeal, already mentioned, by another addressed to this new pope. In this appellatory document he endeavoured to point out what was arbitrary and unreasonable in the conduct

of the affair, and such as by the laws of human nature always take place under similar circumstances. The abbot of Dola says of the archbishop: Factus fuit ex inobedientia et rebellione illius Mag. Hus velut contemptibilis et paene fabula in populo, ita ut plerique insolentes vulgares ac ironicas de eodem viro dei confingerent et decanerent cantiones publice per plateas contra justissimam et zelo catholicae fidei commodam combustionem librorum istius haereticae pravitatis. Cujus cum frequentationem et irreverentiae Christi odiosam multiplicationem lenocinantis cantici didicisset serenissimus et magnificus princeps Romanorum et Bohemiae rex Wenceslaus, divino edoctus spiritu, volens tam stolidam et publicam irreverentiam devota et debita recompensare reverentia, regio publicae vocis statuit decreto, ut nequaquam quisquam amplius eandem dementiae cantilenam non solum sub facultatum forensium, sed et sub capitalis sententiae poena audeat decantare. Stephen of Dola in Antihussus, by Petz, iv. 2, p. 417 and 418.

1 Pez. thes. iv. 2, pag. 386.

2 Malum dico combustionem librorum, quae combustio nullum peccatum de cordibus hominum (nisi condemnatores probaverint) sustulit, sed veritates multas et sententias pulchras et subtiles in scripto destruxit, et in populo disturbia, invidias, diffamationes, odia multiplicavit et homicidia. Hus pro defensione libri de trinitate Joann. Wicklef, opp. i. fol. 106.

of Zbynek, that he had caused books to be burned which contained no theological matter whatever, but which related simply to worldly sciences, quite contrary to the example of holy men of old, as, for example, Moses and Daniel, who appropriated to themselves the knowledge of unbelieving nations. Paul cited verses from Grecian poets; the church had always sanctioned the practice of studying the books of heretics for the purpose of refuting them; and at the universities provided with papal privileges, the writings of Aristotle and Averrhoes were studied, though they contained much that was contrary to the truths of faith. The writings of Origen were not burned, and yet heresies were to be found in them; and in the short space of time occupied by the commission, it was impossible that so many books could be so thoroughly read and examined as to enable the members to pass judgment upon them. Against the prohibition to preach in Bethlehem chapel, he contends that Christ, who left behind him the seed of his word as the provision for souls, did not mean to have it bound. Christ himself preached everywhere, in the streets, in the fields, and on the lake. For if he had not left behind, for us, the seed of his word, we should have been even as Sodom and Gomorrah. After his resurrection, he had transferred the office of preaching to his disciples for ever. With this commission of Christ, and the ordinances of the fathers, this prohibition of Zbynek stood in direct contradiction. And he cites the rule that, in things necessary to salvation, one should obey God rather than man. Huss made this appeal in conjunction with many other masters and preachers.[1] The language which he employs in it was little suited indeed to be understood or appreciated by the monster John XXIII. and the court which he had gathered. Huss, from this time onward, composed several writings, which seem to have had their origin in public disputations held by him in the university;[2] and in these productions he expounded, more at length, the reasons why he could not obey the archbishop in those ordinances, and defended many doctrines and writings of Wicklif against the condemnation that had been passed on them. These papers

1 Appellatio Joann. Hus ab Archiepiscopo ad sedem apostolicam, opp. i. fol. 89.

2 As we infer from the words with which his tract De trinitate begins: Cathedram ascendo. Opp. i. fol. 105.

evince the Christian temper of his mind at that time; they show how firmly resolved he was already to suffer the loss of all things for the cause of Christ, and that even then martyrdom was not far absent from his thoughts; and they also show with what enthusiastic confidence, inspired by a Christian sense of the force of truth, he looked forward to the ultimate triumph of the truth he defended. We may mention here his tract *De trinitate*, which he wrote in the year 1410. He begins the public academical act, from which that paper proceeded, by explaining, that it had never entered into his mind to persist in obstinately maintaining anything which was contrary to the Holy Scriptures, or in any way erroneous; but if he asserted anything of this sort, from ignorance or inadvertency, he would cheerfully and humbly retract it. And if any person of the church, whoever he might be, would teach him better by quotation from Scripture, or rational argument, he was perfectly ready to concur with him. "For"—he says—"from the earliest period of my studies until now, have I laid it down as a rule, that whenever I heard a more correct opinion on any subject whatever advanced, I would, with joy and humility, give up my earlier opinion; being well aware that what we know is vastly less than what we do not know."[1] In a later paper on Tythes, of the year 1412, he points out three different sources of the knowledge of that truth which is always to be held fast—Holy Scripture, reason, and of the senses experience.[2] Not as though Huss meant to place these truths on a level, as to their *substance* and *matter*; but as truthfulness, and steadfastness in maintaining that which had been made out as true, belonged among the fundamental traits of his character, so he was resolved never to give up, at any price, a truth which he had gained, whatever it might be, or from whatever source it might have come. We see how, in the soul of Huss, it was a principle already formed and firmly established, to derive all the truths of faith directly from Scripture, and to acknow-

1 Nam a primo studii mei tempore hoc mihi statui pro regula, ut quotiescunque saniorem setentiam in quacunque materia perciperem, a priori sententia gaudenter et humiliter declinarem, sciens, quoniam illa quae scimus, sunt minima illorum, quae ignoramus. Hus de trinitate, opp. i., fol. 105.

2 Videlicet in veritate in scriptura sacra explicita, in veritate ab infallibili ratione elaborata et in veritate experimentaliter a sensu cognita. Hus de decimis, opp. i., fol. 125, 2.

ledge nothing to be such truth which did not appear to rest on that foundation. As Christ was the great centre of his faith and of his life, so he had determined to adhere only to his word as the rule of faith and life. But with this he could still join a firm adherence to the existing doctrines of the church, being not as yet conscious of any contradiction between them and the sacred Scriptures; because his whole theological development had sprung out of the practical element. As he had not the remotest idea of deserting the actual church and forming a new one, so he could still seek to unite the two things together; though he was already firmly resolved to sacrifice everything to the truth as clearly gathered from the Scriptures, and to reject all that stood in conflict with it, or which he clearly made out to be such. He still clung to church tradition; but it appeared to him only as the historical evolution of the truth contained, as to its essence, in the sacred Scriptures, an evolution of the germs therein contained, as he expresses it in his tract *De decimis*,[1] mentioned just above, where he says: "Law, as determined by the prelates, is styled canonical law; and its purpose is to restrain, within due limits, whatever stands in conflict with the holy laws of the church. It may be compared with the evangelical law, the latter being the articles of faith which have been determined by the holy synods. As the man remains the same, though he may appear in a different dress, and under different, changeable, and accidental characters, so it is in the same law or the same evangelical truth which is contained *implicitly*, or unfolded in the gospel, and is afterwards expounded by the church in another but not contradictory manner."[2] He declares, in reference to the forty-five propositions of Wicklif, "Because it tends to prejudice too much the interests of salvation, to condemn any truth without examination,[3] as our

1 Hus opp. i. fol. 128, 2.

2 Jus canonicum vocatur jus a praelato vel praelatis institutum et promulgatum ad rebelles sacris regulis coercendum. Et potest etiam intelligi, ut communicans juri evangelico, ut sunt articuli fidei, in sanctis synodis sive conciliis explanati. Sicut enim idem est homo in vestibus aut accidentibus notitiam inducentibus varians, sic eadem est lex vel veritas evangelica in evangelio implicita vel detecta, et per ecclesiam postmodum aliter, sed non contrarie explanata.

3 In the edition lying before us we find, it is true, examine condemnare veritatem; but we think we may take it for granted that this, as many other passages in this edition of the works of Huss, is incorrect, and that the text should read, sine examine. Defens. quor. art. J. Wiclef, opp. i. fol. 111.

Lord says, Judge not, that ye be not judged, the University of Prague demands, so far as it does not concur in the condemnation of those forty-five articles, the proof, from the appointed doctors, of the reasonableness of that condemnation, and that they should show wherein each of those articles is false, by the authority of Scripture, or by arguments of infallible reason."

In reference to the prohibition directed against preaching in Bethlehem chapel, he says: "Where is there any authority of Holy Writ, or where are there any rational grounds for forbidding preaching in so public a place, fitted up for that very purpose, in the midst of the great city of Prague? Nothing else can be at the bottom of this; but the jealousy of antichrist.[1] He exhibits Pope Alexander V. in contrast with the apostles. "For" says he—"when that pope heard at his court that Bohemia received the word of God, he did not send Peter and John to pray for the Bohemians, and to lay their hands on them, that in hearing the word of God they might receive the Holy Ghost; but he sent back some ill-disposed persons belonging to Bohemia, and commanded, in his bull, that the word of God should not be preached in private chapels."[2] Huss opposes to the arbitrary self-will of a man, which would hinder him from preaching, his own divine call. He says: "He who lives comformably to the law of Christ, and animated by a disposition of sincere love, has singly in view the glory of God, and his own and his neighbour's salvation, and preaches not lies, not ribaldry, not fables, but the law of Christ and the doctrines of the holy fathers of the church, he who so preaches when times of distress come, when a pope or a bishop is wanting, or he who takes his stand in opposition to heretics or false teachers, such a person never arrogates

1 De trinit., opp. i. fol. 106, 2. The abbot of Dola quotes as a common saying among the party of Huss, that the word of God cannot be bound. His opinion on the contrary was, that Huss had not been forbidden to preach at all, but only, for special reasons, to preach in this particular chapel; and here the duty of obedience to his superiors ought to have been felt by him as of paramount obligation. The Bethlehem Chapel is here denominated the Wiclefistarum insidiosa spelunca. It had not been forbidden him to preach, but to found a school in this place; which, however, in the sense of Huss, was nothing else than to found here a genuine Christian Church; though to this abbot it would appear only as a "School of Satan." So he expresses himself: Non ut verbum Christi occultetur, sed ut occasio conventiculi et satanicae scholae illus impii Wicleff haeretici de medio tolleretur. Antihussus Pez thes. iv. 2, pag. 373.

2 Responsio ad scriptum octo doctorum, opp. i. fol. 298, 1.

to himself the call to preach without authority; and it is not to be doubted, that the man in such case is sent of God." The internal divine call, Huss asserts, which springs from the work of the Holy Spirit on the soul, is of more authority than any outward call proceeding from men; and a person may be constrained by this internal call from God to stand forth even in opposition to the ordinances of man. Those ecclesiastical laws had been given only for the purpose of restraining the bad. Not for a righteous man is the law made, but for sinners. Where the spirit of God is, there is liberty.[1] Now we may easily conceive how revolting such language of Christian freedom of spirit must have appeared to those who knew of nothing higher than the stiff ordinances of the church; how they must have looked upon it as tending to the overthrow of all ecclesiastical order. But the objection now brought up, was that such an internal divine call was hidden from all but the subject of it. Every man could affirm this of himself: every heretic, every fanatic, might stand up under that pretence. Some outward sign of such an internal divine call was requisite therefore; either an express testimony of Holy Scripture, or an evident miracle. To this Huss replied: and the reader will be struck with the coincidence of the views he expresses with those of Matthew of Janow,—"Antichrist was to have the power of deceiving by wonders. In the last times, miracles are to be retrenched from the church. She is to go about only in the form of a servant; she is to be tried by patience. The lying wonders of the servants of antichrist are to serve for the trial of faith. By its own intrinsic power, faith shall preserve itself in the elect, superior to all arts of deception. This is the substance of that which Huss sets forth and illustrates by copious extracts from the sayings of the older church teachers. Prophecy"—he says—"is wrapt in obscurity; the gift of healing removed; the power of long-protracted fasting diminished; the word of doctrine silent; miracles are withheld. Not that divine providence utterly suspends these things; but they are not to be seen openly and in great variety, as in earlier times. All this, however, is so ordered by a wonderful arrangement of divine providence,

1 Justo enim lex non est posita, sed ubi spiritus dei, ibi libertas, et si spiritu dei ducimini, non estis sub lege. Def. articul. quor. J. Wicleff, opp. i. fol. 115.

that God's mercy and justice may be revealed precisely in this way; for while the church of Christ must, after the withdrawal of her miraculous gifts, appear in greater lowliness, and the righteous who venerate her on account of the hope of heavenly good, not on account of visible signs, fail of their reward in this earthly life, there will, on the other hand, be a more speedy manifestation of the temper of the wicked who, disdaining to follow after the invisible things which the church promises, cling fast to visible signs."[1]

In this mode of contemplating the condition of the church in the last times, we recognize an adherent of the doctrine of absolute predestination; though the truth contained in these same views might also be held independent of this doctrine. The servant-form of the true church, in which the power of the *invisible* god-like is all that attracts, as contrasted with the abundance of lying wonders in the worldly church of antichrist, appearing in visible glory, serves as a means of separating the elect from the reprobate. The elect must pass through this trial in order to bring out their genuine character; the reprobate must be deceived according to the just judgment of God. He proceeds to infer, therefore, from what had been said, that in these times it is rather the servants of antichrist, than the servants of Christ, who will make themselves known by wonders. He says: "It is a greater miracle to confess the truth and practise righteousness, than to perform marvellous works to the outward senses." And he then adds: The priest or deacon who loves his enemies, despises riches, esteems as nothing the glory of this world, avoids entangling himself in worldly business, and patiently endures terrible threatenings, even persecutions for the gospel's sake, such a priest or deacon performs miracles, and has the witness within him that he is a genuine disciple of Christ. He appeals to

1 Nam prophetia absconditur, curationum gratia aufertur, prolixioris abstinentiae virtus imminuitur, doctrinae verba conticescunt, miraculorum prodigia tollentur. Quae quidem nequaquam superna dispositio funditus subtrahit, sed non haec, sicut prioribus temporibus aperte ac multipliciter ostendit, quod tamen mira dispensatione agitur, ut una ex re divina simul et pietas et justitia compleatur, dum enim subtractis miraculorum virtutibus sancta ecclesia velut abjectior apparet et bonorum praemium quiescit, qui illam propter spem coelestium, non propter praesentia signa venerantur, et malorum mens contra illa citius ostenditur, qui sequi quae promittit invisibilia negligunt, dum signis visibilibus continentur. Defensio articul. quor. J. Wicleff, opp. i., fol. 115, 2.

various fine remarks of Augustin, Gregory, and Chrysostom, on miracles, those witnesses to the genuine Christian view of the miracle, which, in spite of all errors, runs through the whole history of the church, and also to the words of Christ, Matt. v. 16; John x. 38; Matt. vii. 22, and then concludes: "It is evident that every priest or deacon, who confesses the truth and practises righteousness, has a virtual testimony in this very thing, that he is sent of God, and that he needs not prove this divine mission by miracles, nor by an express passage of Holy Writ, relating personally to himself as one sent of God to preach the gospel."[1]

Even now Huss gives utterance to the resolution, which he observed faithfully to the end. "In order that I may not make myself guilty, then, by my silence, forsaking the truth for a piece of bread, or through fear of man, I avow it to be my purpose to defend the truth which God has enabled me to know, and especially the truth of the Holy Scriptures, even to death; since I know that the truth stands, and is forever mighty, and abides eternally; and with her there is no respect of persons.[2] And, if the fear of death should terrify me, still I hope in my God and in the assistance of the Holy Spirit, that the Lord himself will give me firmness. And if I have found favour in his sight, he will crown me with martyrdom.[3] But, what more glorious triumph is there than this? Inciting his faithful to this victory our Lord says: Fear not them that kill the body, (Matt. x. 28)." We may here add the words uttered by Huss in his tract on Tythes: "As it is necessary for men gifted with reason to hear, to speak, and to love the truth, and to guard carefully against everything that

1 Ex his patet, quod quilibet diaconus vel sacerdos confitens veritatem et faciens justitiam habet testimonium efficax, quod ipse est missus a deo, et quod non oportet ipsum probare illam missionem per operationem miraculi, propter operationem justitiae, nec per scripturam, quae expresse ipsum nomine exprimeret, quod ad evangelisandum a domino foret missus. Ibid. fol. 116, 2.

2 Ne ergo istis speciebus consensus percuterer et specialiter consensu non reprehensionis, mutescens culpabiliter, propter buccellam panis, aut propter timorem humanum doserens veritatem, volo veritatem, quam mihi deus cognoscere concesserit, et praesertim scripturae divinae usque ad mortem defendere, sciens, quia veritas manet et invalescit in aeternum et obtinet in saecula saeculorum, apud quam non est accipere personas neque differentias. De trin., opp. i., 106.

3 Et si timor mortis terrere voluerit, spero de deo meo et spiritus sancti auxilio, quod ipse dominus dabit constantiam. Et si gratiam invenero in oculis suis, martyrio coronabit. Ibid.

might thwart it; as the truth itself triumphs over everything and is mighty forever, (where he refers to the words of Christ: Let your communication be Yea, yea; nay, nay); who, but a fool, would venture to condemn or to affirm any article, especially in what pertains to faith and manners, until he has informed himself about the truth of it?"[1] If some writers, both in ancient[2] and in modern times, have been disposed to find in Huss a proud or a fanatical striving after martyrdom, we cannot in this agree with them at all. It was simply the presentiment of death, which could not, in such a time, fail to fill the mind of a witness for the truth, coming out in the face of the world: for that truth to which he had devoted his entire life as a sacrifice. The conduct of Huss down to the hour of his martyrdom will show us nothing but the genuine Christian martyr, who with enthusiasm, yet with cool self-possession and resignation to the divine will, seeks not, but accepts when offered the martyr's crown in godly joy from the hand of the giver. It was laid as a serious charge against Huss, as we have seen, that he publicly discussed contested articles of faith. In reference to this, he says: "How often did Christ dispute with companies of the Jews and priests; how often, according to the Acts of the Apostles, did his disciples, how often have the holy teachers of the church, and the scholastic doctors, disputed on the matters of faith."[3]

The principles of Wicklif which Huss defended, contained much that would make him appear to the advocates of the old heirarchical system a very dangerous adversary, a destructionist; and Huss himself, in defending these principles, was led to say many things which doubtless were liable to misapprehension. We have already remarked that, with Wicklif, he looked upon it as the destination of the clergy to copy, in all things, the example of Christ, who took upon him the form of a servant, and to

1 De decimis, opp. i. fol. 125, 2.

2 The abbot of Dola, in the year 1411, already finds that Huss will die at the stake rather than recant; but from his false conception of humility and obedience, taken from the position of Roman Catholicism, he sees in this only a want of humility, and spiritual pride. So he says: Antequam humiliatus revocans revocanda de tuae sublimitatis descenderes pestilenti cathedra, ut vel sic tuorum lapidea corda confirmares te sequentium, traderes te potius flammis ultricibus concremandum. Antihussus, Pez thes. iv. 2, pag. 383.

3 De trinitate, opp. i. fol. 107, 2.

resemble him therefore in poverty. Whatever the clergy obtained for their support, should be regarded simply as gift of free love. The spontaneous affection of those for whose spiritual benefit they laboured, should afford them what was necessary for the body. But they should require only what was absolutely needful for their support, and nothing which ministered to superfluity.[1] From the superfluous abundance of temporal goods, he derived the corruption of the worldly clergy.[2] He was forced to complain that, especially in Bohemia, the fourth part of all the landed estates were in the hands of the clergy. Accordingly, with Wicklif, he finds the princes to be in the right; and looks upon it as a work of Christian charity in them to deprive the clergy of that superfluity of earthly goods which they abused, and which was the means of their corruption.[3] Thus should the clergy be brought back to poverty and to the holy life of the primitive apostolical church. This was an error, indeed, in the case of Huss as well as of Wicklif; an error that was followed by mischievous consequences, and which arose from their not paying sufficient regard to the course things had actually taken in history, and from their supposing that a glorious condition of the church connected with an altogether different stage of progress, was to be thus suddenly restored from without. In expressing these views, Huss attached them to a proposition already laid down by the ancient teachers of the church, which, theoretically considered, contained in it a sublime truth, leading the mind back to Christ himself and the apostles; but which, empirically apprehended and applied to practice, might lead to the overthrow of all social order; the proposition, namely, that all rightful holding of property, in the sight of God, was conditioned on the subjective worth of the owner; that ownership could be predicted only of the righteous; in support of which it was already customary among the ancients to quote Prov. xvii. 6, according to the Septuagint version and the Vul-

1 Compare his tract De decimis, of the year 1412.

2 Cum plus quam quarta pars regni sit devoluta ad manum mortuam. De ablatione bonorum, vol. i. 1412, opp. i. fol. 122, 2.

3 L. c. fol. 120, 2: Rectificatio facillima cleri ad vitam Christi et apostolorum et pertinentior laicis, ne ipsi clerici vivant Christo contrarie, videtur esse eleemosynarum subtractio et collatarum ablatio.

gate. Now when this proposition was employed in justification of the act of depriving the unworthy of their property, the consequences, no doubt, would be very bad. Huss cites, in favour of it, 1 Cor. iii. 21.[1] To the same category belongs, also, his defence of Wicklif's proposition that no man is lord over any possession, no man can be king, or bishop, if he is in mortal sin. Huss distinguished three kinds of property, that grounded in nature, that grounded in civil law, and that proceeding from grace and justice. It never entered his thoughts to make sovereignty and supreme authority dependant on the personal worth of the incumbent, or to approve of rebellion against authority not so founded. The very distinction just set forth stood opposed to any such mode of apprehending and applying the proposition. He affirms what, rightly understood, could not be denied, that mortal sin infected not the whole life only, but as well every single action of the man in detail; that everything depended on the governing disposition, which gave to everything its moral character. But nothing could be gained by this; nothing but mischief could ensue when a proposition, correct in itself, was so paradoxically expressed, and applied to questions of right, a province of life where it ought never to be applied. Had it not been for the barren, subtle method of scholasticism in which the fifteenth century was still entangled to a far greater degree than the flourishing period of scholasticism had been in the thirteenth century, Huss would not have expended so much labour in demonstrating a point so unfruitful in its practical application and so liable to be misapprehended. But Huss defends himself against the reproach, that by his mode of representing office as being conditioned on the personal worth of the holder, he destroyed its objective efficiency. He says, "we concede that a bad pope, bishop, or priest, is an unworthy minister of those sacraments by which God baptizes and consecrates, or in other ways operates for the advancement of his church. But in the same way he ordains much that is good through the instrumentality of the devil as his minister, being very mighty, glorious, and praiseworthy in this, that he effects such glorious ends by so reprobate

[1] Temporales autem domini procedentes secundum caritatis regulam juste possident illa temporalia, cum justorum sunt omnia. De ablat. bon., opp. i. fol. 119, 2.

a minister. But the minister effects it to his own condemnation."[1]

We have already remarked that the adversaries of Huss, who would have been very glad to represent him as an opponent of the doctrine of transubstantiation, since this would have served beyond anything else to fix upon him the charge of heresy, availed themselves for this purpose (perverting his words) of that spiritual apprehension of this sacrament in its significance for the internal Christian life, which was made specially prominent by Huss in his preaching. As Huss ever laid great stress on the expression that Christ is himself the bread of the soul, the provision for eternal life, his enemies seized on such expressions to create a suspicion that he did not really believe in the flesh and blood of Christ in the Lord's supper, as that into which the bread and wine had been transformed. It was the whispering about of such a suspicion which seems to have led Huss to compose his tract *De Corpore Christi*. In this treatise also, we see how he gives prominence only to the practical side of religion; how very far he is from wishing to contend against the doctrine of transubstantiation. He portrays, in this tract, first the character of the gross Jews (grossi Judæi), who would not acknowledge Christ to be the bread of the soul, who said the body of Christ was broken, comminuted with the teeth, seen with the bodily eyes, and touched with the hands. We recognize here the same class of people that appeared first against Berenger, who, for the purpose of cutting off all possibility of a spiritual apprehension of the mystery, selected the most carefully-sought crass style of expression respecting the body of Christ in the supper, and who were ready to detect, in every more spiritual mode of expression, a denial of transubstantiation. He says of these people that in grossness of apprehension they were to be compared with those Jews who murmured against Christ in the synagogue of Capernaum (John vi.). He joins those opponents of the crass phraseology respecting the body of Christ produced by the consecration, Hugo de St Victor, Hildebert of Mans, and even Innocent III., in saying that "Christ is manducated spiritually. He abides in his divinity and his body wholly in heaven, and he abides in

1 Responsio ad scripta Paletz, opp. i., fol. 256.

his divinity and his humanity wholly within the heart, so long as the sacrament is with thee. But when thou art not receiving the sacrament, and art without mortal sin, although he does not sacramentally and in his humanity abide in thee, he still, in his divinity and through grace, dwells in thy heart." He thinks it of importance to note, distinctly, that what the senses perceive is one thing, and what the eye of faith discerns, quite another, a distinction which could be made without affecting the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Meantime the cause of Huss assumed a much darker aspect in the Roman court. The report of Archbishop Zbynek relative to the Bohemian disturbances met with a far more cordial reception than the appeal of Huss, which was scarcely noticed. The pope committed the matter for investigation into the hands of Cardinal Otto of Colonna, the same who was afterwards chosen pope by the council of Constance. This cardinal confirmed the sentence passed by Archbishop Zbynek, and cited Huss to appear at Bologna, where the pope was then residing. This mode of proceeding aroused the indignation of the important party of Huss in Bohemia. Huss and his friends could with justice affirm that, owing to the great number of his enemies in Germany, it would not be safe for him to undertake such a journey; that it would be sacrificing his life for nothing. In truth, the worst, and nothing but the worst, was to be expected, even should Huss succeed in getting to the Roman court, where there were so many to whom he had made himself odious by attacking the corruptions that prevailed at that court.[1] Queen Sophia used all her interest in behalf of her father confessor. Wenceslaus, who looked upon Archbishop Zbynek as the author of all the

[1] The abbot of Dola, in his dialogue written in the year 1414, represents the "*Goose*," that is, Huss, his name signifying this in the Bohemian language, as saying, "I have many reasons for not obeying the citation to Rome. It was my intention, at first, to appear there; but my counsel and the counsel of the other party wrote me, that I should not come, because it would be sacrificing my life to no purpose. I refused, then, because I did not wish to neglect the people in the word of God, nor to expose my life when nothing was to be gained by it; for when a man stands before him as his judge, whose sins he has recklessly attacked, he manifestly gives himself up to death." To this his antagonist replied: "Huss, placing his confidence in God, had nothing to fear, and, after the example of Christ, ought to have appeared even before an unjust judge." Steph. Dol. dialogus volatilis, Pez iv., 2, pag. 464 et 465 auda et passer.

disturbances, the man who had brought his kingdom under suspicion, wrote in favour of Huss to the pope in Bologna and to the college of Cardinals. He begged the pope to put a stop to the whole process, to impose silence on the enemies of Huss, to suppress the dispute concerning the books of Wicklif; since it was evident, that in his kingdom no man had fallen into error or heresy by occasion of those writings. "It is our will, too"—he wrote—"that Bethlehem Chapel, which, for the glory of God and the saving good of the people, we have endowed with franchises for the preaching of the gospel, should stand, and should be confirmed in its privileges; so that its patrons may not be deprived of their rights of patronage, and that Master Huss (whom he styles the loyal, devout, and beloved) may be established over this chapel and preach the word of God in peace." He demanded of the pope, moreover, that the personal citation of Huss should be revoked; and if any one had anything to object to him, that he should present his objections there within the realm and before the University of Prague, or some other competent tribunal.[1] King Wenzel sent, in company with this letter to the pope, Doctor Nass, and Master John Cardinalis of Reinstein, a man often employed in embassies, a friend of Huss, and one who afterwards took an important part in the Hussite movements; and they were to request the pope to send a legate to Bohemia at the king's expense. He also wrote to Cardinal Colonna; and requested him to come to Prague himself, and inform himself of the actual state of things by personal observation. He directed that the pope should be informed by Doctor Nass, to whom the pope was a personal friend, that nothing but his respect for the pope prevented him from bringing the author of all these disturbances in his kingdom to condign punishment. Huss at the same time sent with these persons three procurators to Rome, as his representatives and advocates in the carrying on of the process—his friend, Master Jesenic, a jurist, and two doctors of theology. Cardinal Colonna had already, in February 1411, pronounced sentence of excommunication *in contumaciam* against Huss, for not obeying the citation. Still, however, the pope was

[1] The letter, according to a manuscript in the Imperial library at Vienna, in Palacky iii. 1. p. 258, and the letter to the cardinals, in Pelzel, Urkundenbuch Nr. 221.

moved by the intercession of the king to take the cause out of the hands of Colonna, and to appoint a new commission; among the members of which we may mention Cardinal Francisco a Zabarellis, archbishop of Florence, as one who, on account of his disposition to favour reform, stood better affected towards Huss than many others. Meanwhile Archbishop Zbynek had made every exertion through his delegates at Bologna to prevent the course already taken against Huss, and his citation from being revoked. He is said to have been most lavish in his presents, sending horses, vases, and costly rings, to the pope, and other gifts of the same kind to the cardinals.[1] But, through some unknown influence, the cause was afterwards transferred to Cardinal Brancas alone, who, in spite of all the remonstrances made by the procurators of Huss, kept the whole affair in suspense for a year and a half. Inasmuch, therefore, as the excommunication of Huss had not been revoked, the archbishop regarded it as valid, and had it published in all the churches except two, whose rectors declined to read it. As regards the procurators of Huss, since they persisted in demanding that his cause should undergo a new investigation, some of them were thrown into prison, the others returned back to Prague when they saw that nothing was to be done. At length, Cardinal Brancas brought up the process against Huss. The former sentence was confirmed with additional severity. The cardinal issued a public declaration, styling Huss a heresiarch, and laying the city where he resided under interdict.[2] Archbishop Zbynek carried this measure into effect, and the interdict was imposed on Prague. But Huss and his friends did not consider themselves bound by these arbitrary sentences, passed without giving both parties a hearing. King Wenzel, whose remonstrances addressed to the archbishop had had so little effect, warmly espoused the side of Huss. The clergy who were inclined to observe the interdict, had to endure violent persecutions; their goods were confiscated; many of them fled the country. Thus the contest between the clergy and the secular power in Bohemia, seemed to have reached its acme; when the whole affair took

1 Chronic. univers. Prag. Ms. in Palacky iii. 1, s. 264, and compare what Master Jenscric says on the matter of the bribes in his protest. Huss opp. i., fol. 332.

2 See the report given by Huss himself, which may serve as the authority for the facts related in the foregoing pages. Opp. i., fol. 86 sq.

another turn, and a hope began to be cherished that the present commotions would yet be hushed to rest. Zbynek was forced to perceive that he was too weak to carry through his purpose in opposition to the king and the party of Huss. Reflecting that the schism in the church still continued to subsist, looking at the feebleness of Pope John, who made himself every day more odious by his abominable life, and his disgraceful administration, Zbynek could not hope for assistance from the Roman court; and, besides, Pope John was too deeply involved in other affairs lying nearer his heart, to be able to bestow any particular attention on the disturbances in Bohemia. The archbishop was forced, therefore, to the conviction, that, if he pushed matters to the extreme, he would only run the risk of losing all his authority in Bohemia; a result which would be inevitable, if sharper spiritual measures were continually resorted to, while yet every one of them was trifled with. Hence he was the rather inclined, for the sake of saving his authority, finally to give way to the efforts of the king and of the university for the restoration of peace, and to offer his hand for reconciliation.

In the beginning of July, 1411, a committee was appointed, consisting of ten,—princes, notables of the secular and spiritual orders—persons who had taken no part in the preceding controversies, to devise the best means for establishing peace in Bohemia. Wenzel, Archbishop Zbynek, and both parties pledged themselves to submit to the decision of this committee.[1] They settled upon the following terms of agreement: King Wenceslaus and the archbishop should both write to the pope, and the latter report to him, that no heresies existed in Bohemia; a new inquiry, however, should be made into this matter, and, if anything of a heretical character might still be found, it should be condignly punished. Zbynek should obtain the pope's consent, that if any person belonging to the Bohemian realm, of the secular or spiritual order, lay under the ban, this should be removed by the pope; both parties should recal their procurators from Rome, and be satisfied with the decision of the king; the archbishop should remove the ban and interdict; and, on the

1 See the report of Penzel, with the documents in the historical work above cited, and the narrative by Huss quoted on the preceding page.

other hand, the king should restore the salaries which had been withholden from the clergy, and release such as were under arrest. Zbynek actually drew up such a letter to the pope, reporting that no heresies were propagated in Bohemia, and requesting him to remove the excommunication which had been pronounced on Huss, and to revoke the citation which had been served on him.[1] In connection with this compact, Huss laid before the university of Prague, in official form, near the beginning of January, in this year, 1411, a confession of faith designed to vindicate himself against those aspersions which had been cast upon his orthodoxy, which confession was to be transmitted to Rome. Huss declares in this paper, that "to show due obedience to the church of Jesus Christ and to its supreme head, I am ready to give to every man an account of the faith that is in me, and confess with my whole heart that Jesus Christ is true God and true man, that his whole law is of such stable truth, that not one jot or tittle thereof can fail; next that his church is so firmly established on the firm rock, that the gates of hell can never prevail against it; and I am ready, trusting on my Lord Jesus Christ, to endure the punishment of a terrible death, sooner than consciously to say anything which would be contrary to the will of Christ and of his church." And so he testified that he had been falsely accused before the apostolical see by his enemies. Among these false accusations, he cites the following: that he had taught the people that the substance of the bread and wine still remained after the consecration; that at the elevation of the host, Christ's body was present, but not when it was set down again; that a priest in mortal sin could not consecrate;[2] that the lords should deprive the clergy of their temporal goods;

1 See the letter in the Works of Huss, i., fol. 87, 2.

2 Huss in his work on Tythes has distinctly expressed this conviction of his respecting the objective character of sacramental acts independent of the subjective character of the person administering them: Cum non virtute propria, sed dei haec faciunt satis rite prosunt ecclesiae. De decimis, opp. i. fol. 134, 1. He was actually accused of having asserted in his sermons about the year 1399, that only a priest in the state of grace and not one chargeable with mortal sin can truly consecrate; but Huss was able to appeal to the fact, that, from the first year of his active labours as a preacher and onward, he had uniformly taught the opposite to this. Comp. Depos. test. in the Stud. u. Krit. 1837, 1. p. 127.

that tythes ought not to be paid ;[1] that indulgences were nothing;[2] that he had advised to the employment of the secular sword against the clergy ; that he had taught some heresy or other, or drawn the people aside from the right faith ; that he had driven the Germans from the University of Prague, etc.[3]

We may observe it as a thing of no rare occurrence in great epochs of the history of the world, where one mode of thinking and feeling has been brought into direct conflict with its opposite, and by means of such conflict the way is preparing for new and important developments, that when these antagonisms have arrived at their utmost tension, a way of compromise or adjustment from some foreign quarter seems to be ready prepared for the occasion. A superficial view of history might lead one to suppose, that now, if some other disturbing cause had not interfered to prevent the adoption of this compromise, and if but this or that means had been added by a cunning policy, the whole course of events would have taken an altogether different direction. But, on the contrary, we should understand, that such a compromise as would seem desirable by those who contemplate the case only from the outside, and are simply wishing for quiet and peace, without any sympathy for the internal struggle of the antagonistic forces, is a thing idle and nugatory in itself, bearing within it the causes of its failure, the seeds of its own frustration ; for it is utterly impossible to sever by outward interference the threads of history, to force back again by some diplomatic mediation or other, deep-grounded antagonisms taken in the midst of their development. The impelling principles and ideas, which constitute history, are of mightier force than the purposes and designs of men. This was seen in the present instance. The reform tendency which had begun with Militz, and had been continually developing itself, and which must, finally, come into inevitable conflict with the hierarchical system—the antagonism between the two tendencies in the Bohemian church, which from this time

1 Huss had not asserted this unconditionally ; but only that *if* the clergy violated their duty and abused their power, they might be deprived of the tythes.

2 Huss had hitherto spoken only against the abuse of indulgences by such as made a trade of spiritual things ; not against the right of granting indulgences itself, with regard to which right it was still under controversy how far it extended.

3 This confession is in the Works of Huss, but more correctly printed in Pelzel, Urkundenbuch Nr. 230.

became daily more distinctly pronounced, could not be suppressed by the momentary interest of the king and the archbishop, and by a compromise of their respective policies. Although, for the moment, the letter of the compact might actually be fulfilled by all the parties concerned, yet sooner or later would the more deep-grounded antagonism again come to an outbreak. Archbishop Zbynek, however, could hardly be quite in earnest about this compromise. He could not become reconciled with the anti-hierarchical party in Bohemia; nor could they, any more, abandon their principles. In truth, Zbynek afterwards expressly declared in his exculpatory letter to the king, that he could not report to the pope that priests who did not observe the interdict, should not be regarded as punishable. He must once more complain, that what he called heresy was preached by many clergymen, and that he was not permitted to apply his ecclesiastical power of punishing to those who set forth erroneous doctrines. It did not require, therefore, the dissatisfaction with King Wenzel, who, as Zbynek pretended, had failed in fulfilling the conditions of the compromise, to prevent the archbishop from complying with his part of the agreement. Since then he could not but foresee that under these circumstances it would be impossible for him to maintain his authority in Bohemia, or to carry out his measures by force, he resolved, instead of fulfilling the terms of the agreement, to quit Bohemia for the present, and to seek assistance from Wenzel's brother, King Sigismund, in Ofen.[1] In the beginning of September of the year 1411, he carried this resolution into effect. But death surprised him before he could have an interview with King Sigismund.[2]

1 The abbot of Dola rightly apprehended the state of the case from his own point of view, as we see from what he says respecting the flight of the archbishop: Affectus taedio (sciens, quod metus pro tempore etiam in constantem virum cadere possit) paululum abscondit se, dum dimissa sui episcopatus pontificali cathedra exivit de terra et dioecesi propria Bohemia.

2 If we may credit the abbot of Dola, this was represented by the Hussite party as a divine judgment, of which interpretation, however, not a trace is to be found in the writings of Huss. The abbot views it rather in the light of a martyrdom, in which the archbishop passes away in the midst of contests to receive the crown of victory. He says: M. Hus se et suam rebellionem justificans magna cum laetitia cum suis omnibus vociferans affirmabat, eundem antistitem, tanquam primum et capitalem adversarium suum, in vindictam et causae suae triumphum sic esse tanquam

The successor of Zbynek was not inclined to take a very lively interest in church controversies; and if an event had not soon after happened by which the opposite parties were necessarily thrown into a more violent and important contest with each other than any which had yet occurred, a temporary truce might have ensued. The individual who assumed the archiepiscopal dignity was a man on good terms with King Wenceslaus, quite ignorant of theological matters and ecclesiastical affairs, and who would have been glad to let everything go on quietly, a man who had been elevated to this post for reasons quite different from a spiritual all. This was Albic of Unitzow, the king's physician, who, after obtaining some reputation as a medical author, had but recently passed through the inferior spiritual grades, and was already at an advanced period of life. To him, peace was the most desirable of all things. But where so many combustible materials were present, it required but a small spark to set everything in flames. An occasion of this sort grew out of circumstances connected with the entrance of the new archbishop upon his office, though without any fault of his own. The papal legate, who bore the pallium to the newly appointed primate, was directed at the same time to publish the bull, put forth in a manner worthy of himself by Pope John XXIII., pronouncing in the most awful forms the curse of the ban on the pope's enemy, King Ladislaus of Naples, adherent of Gregory XII., as on a heretic, a schismatic, a man guilty of high treason against the majesty of God; and proclaiming a crusade for the destruction of his party; together with a bull granting full indulgence to all who took part in this crusade. All who personally bore arms in this crusade were promised, if they truly repented and confessed themselves (which, in this connection, surely could mean nothing but a mere form,) the forgiveness of their sins, as fully as in participating in any other crusade. Following the example of cupidity set up by Boniface IX., this bull offered the like indulgence to those also who would contribute as much in money, as in proportion to their means, they would have expended by actively engaging in this crusade for the space of a month. The papal legate, who from what he had heard about Huss might probably expect to meet with oppo-

profugum exstinctum. On the contrary, says he: ut sui certaminis optimae retributionis reciperet praemia. Antihussus, Pez iv. 2, pag. 418 et 419.

sition on his part, requested archbishop Albic to summon Huss before him, and, in the archbishop's presence, demanded of him whether he would obey the apostolical mandates? Huss declared that he was ready with all his heart to obey the apostolical mandates. Then said the legate to the archbishop: "Do you see? the master is quite ready to obey the apostolical mandates?" But Huss rejoined: "My lord, understand me well. I said I am ready, with all my heart, to fulfil the *apostolical* mandates; but I call apostolical mandates the doctrines of the apostles of Christ; and so far as the *papal* mandates agree with these, so far I will obey them most willingly. But if I see anything in them at variance with these, I shall not obey, even though the stake were staring me in the face."[1] In fact he was too deeply imbued with the spirit of the gospel not to turn with disgust from such papal bulls as these. He had the good of souls too near at heart not to feel constrained, by a sort of necessity, to prevent the corruption and ruin which must accrue to religion and morality, from the execution of such bulls. He had until now, as we have seen, simply attacked the abuses in the matter of indulgences, practised by the wicked clergy. He was now led to enter more deeply into the whole subject; and by so doing would, of necessity, be led also to advance another stage in his attacks upon the pope. King Wenzel, who was incapable of calculating the consequences of this affair, was induced from motives of policy to grant his consent to the publication of the bull. The forms of absolution, drawn up in accordance with this bull, were such that Stephen Paletz, thus far the friend of Huss, and then dean of the theological faculty, himself first directed the attention of Huss to the objectionable features in them, and declared to him that such things ought not to be approved. Huss says of Paletz: "If he

1 Requisitus coram Pragensi archiepiscopo Albico per legatos Romani Pontificis Joannis XXIII., an velim mandatis apostolicis obedire, respondi, quod affecto cordialiter implere mandata apostolica. Legati vero habentes pro convertibili mandata apostolica et mandata Romani Pontificis, aestimabant, quod vellem erectionem crucis contra regem Apuliae Ladislaum et contra omnem gentem sibi subditam et contra Gregorium XII. populo praedicare. Unde dicebant legati: Ecce domine archiepiscope! ipse jam mandatis domini nostri vult parere. Quibus dixi: Domini intelligatis me. Ego dixi, quod affecto cordialiter implere mandata apostolica et ipsis omnino obedire sed voco mandata apostolica doctrinas apostolorum Christi, et de quanto mandata Pontificis concordaverint cum mandatis et doctrinis apostolicis, secundum regulam legis Christi, de tanto volo ipsis paratissime obedire. Sed si quid adversi concepero, non obediam, etiamsi ignem pro combustione mei corporis meis oculis praeponatis. Responsio ad scriptum octo doctorum, opp. i., fol. 293, 2.

confesses the truth, he will own that, in relation to the articles of absolution which he was the first to make known to me, he declared them to contain palpable errors."[1] Huss, therefore, might still be hoping to stand united with his old friends in this contest. But the contrary was soon manifest. The opposite temper of the men must needs come forth to the light, when the question to be decided was, as at present, whether the cause of evangelical truth should appear paramount to all temporal and churchly interests. And in the minds of Stephen Paletz and Stanislaus of Znaim the course to be taken in such a crisis seems to have been already decided by impressions left at an earlier date, and the force of which could never be lost on men of their stamp, who had no idea of becoming martyrs for the cause of gospel truth. Among the persons sent by King Wenceslaus, in the year 1408, as envoys to Pope John at Bologna, to treat for his vote in favour of that prince as a candidate for the imperial dignity, were these two individuals; and the stand which they had taken until this time, amid the controversies in Bohemia, may have brought it about—unless, perhaps, it was brought about by the freedom of their remarks on the way—that they were cast into prison and deprived of all they possessed. It was only by the interposition of the college of cardinals that they recovered their liberty. Huss certainly had just reasons for suspecting that they were intimidated by this danger, into which they had been brought by the free expression of their opinions, and that they meant to be more cautious for the future. He says of Stanislaus, he had boldly defended those forty-five articles in the convocation of the university, and continued to do so till he was forced to write the contrary, till he was oppressed by the court of Rome, and robbed of his property by him whom he now calls head of the holy Catholic church.[2] And in replying to a statement of Stanislaus, that the pope was the safest refuge for all the faithful, Huss remarked that Christ, with infinitely more ease, could have prepared a safer place of refuge for Stanislaus and Paletz, than in the Roman court, by enabling them to arrive

1 Si enim vult veritatem, fateri, recognoscet, quod articulos absolutionum, quos ipse mihi manu sua praesentaverat, dicebat esse errores manu palpabiles. Resp. ad script. Steph. Paletz, opp. i. fol. 264, 2.

2 Resp. ad script. Stanislai de Znoyma, opp. i. fol. 288, 1.

at the certain truth in a doubtful matter without subjecting them to robbery and imprisonment.[1] Intimidated in this way already, the two men were not disposed to resist the execution of a bull in Bohemia which met with the king's approbation, and to fall wholly out with the pope. They now appeared as defenders of the pope's authority against Huss, and stood up for obedience to superiors, whose commands no man should presume to examine into. Paletz, in the name of the theological faculty, offered a resolution of this sort: "We do not take it upon us to raise objections against the lord apostolical or his letters, to pass any judgment whatever upon them, or to determine anything with regard to them; as we have no authority for it."[2] But Huss, in accordance with his principles, could not believe in any such blind obedience; obedience to his Master Christ, the observance of *his* doctrine, and the copying of *his* example, stood first in importance with him. This was the rule by which everything was to be examined, by which the limit of all obedience was determined; and this principle it was, by occasion of which it was laid to his charge that, by making the commands of the superior dependant on the criticising judgment of his subjects, he relaxed the bonds of all civil and ecclesiastical order; and accordingly it was remarked, that by the course he pursued he would introduce the dangerous error that obedience might be refused to letters patent of popes, emperors, kings, and lords, if the truth and reasonableness of such letters could not be made clear to the understanding of the subjects. And who could calculate what disorders would spring up, all over the world, from this opinion?"[3] So he was called a revolutionist. His opponents believed, it is true, that men were bound to unconditional obedience to those in power only in that which was not absolutely wicked, or that which is in itself indifferent.[4] But to what extent was the

1 Resp. ad. Script. Stanislai de Znoyma opp. i. fol. 288, 1.

2 Nolumus nec attendimus attentare aliquid contra dominum apostolicum aut suas literas, aut eas quovis modo judicare vel definire, cum ad hoc nullam auctoritatem habeamus. Adv. indulgentias papales, opp. i. fol. 175, 1.

3 Resp. ad script. octo doct., opp. i. fol. 294, 1.

4 Ipsi enim posuerunt, quod Papae semper est obediendum, dum praecipit quod est purum bonum, et quod non est purum malum, sed medium. Resp. ad script. St Paletz, opp. i. fol. 263, 2.

phrase, "that which is in itself indifferent," to be stretched? As for Huss, he could not look upon that which the bull required as a thing indifferent, but only as a thing directly opposed to the law of Christ, and sinful. To obey, in this case, would be the same as to abandon his principle of obeying God rather than man. He then spoke for the last time with his old friend Paletz, whom he next met as his fiercest enemy, preparing destruction for him at Constance. His last words to him, the words with which he must sunder the tie of friendship that had so long united them, were an adaptation of Aristotle's remark in speaking of his relation to Socrates: "Paletz is my friend, truth is my friend; and both being my friends, it is my sacred duty to give the first honour to truth."[1] An important crisis for the fate of Huss and the reform movements in Bohemia, was the sundering of the bond which united the Bohemian party at Prague University, a party which had thus far been kept together by identity of philosophical and theological, as well as of national interests. In proportion to the cordiality of their earlier friendship, was now the virulence of the animosity between these men, as generally happens in transitions from friendship to enmity. Neither his friend nor his teacher could ever forgive Huss for presuming to stand forth against their authority, as well as the authority of the whole theological faculty, composed of eight doctors, for presuming to be more bold and more free minded than themselves. Huss himself marks the critical moment which separated him for ever from his former associates: "The sale of indulgences and the lifting of the standard of the cross against Christians, first cut me off from my old friends."[2] Compelled to stand forth as an opponent to his old teacher Stanislaus of Znaim, he still never forgot his obligations to him as an instructor; as he says in the paper he wrote against him:—"Though Stanislaus was my teacher, from whom, in the discipline of the school, I learnt a great deal that is valuable, still I must answer him as the truth

1 Amicus Paletz, amica veritas, utrisque amicis existentibus, sanctum est prachonorare veritatem. Ibid. fol. 264, 2.

2 Nam indulgentiarum venditio et crucis adversus Christianos erectio me ab isto doctore primum separavit. Ibid.

impels me to do, that the truth may be more apparent."[1] Huss felt himself called upon to lay a firm foundation for his convictions on these subjects. He resolved to hold a disputation on indulgences, before a numerous convocation of the university, where also his friend Jerome intended to appear, having first, by many posted bills, directed public attention to this disputation, which was to be held on the 7th of June. We learn in what way Huss attacked the papal bulls and the whole subject of indulgences, in this disputation, from the paper in which he drew out at length his remarks on that occasion;[2] and for the purpose of getting a more exact knowledge of the Christian position on which Huss planted himself, and of his activity at this particular crisis, we propose to enter a little more minutely into the contents of this performance. Huss begins by explaining what had led him into the contest: "I was moved to engage in this affair" —he says—"by a threefold interest; the glory of God, the advancement of holy church, and my own conscience. Therefore in relation to all that is now to be said, I call God Almighty and omniscient to witness, that I seek first of all things God's glory and the good of the church. For to these objects every mature Christian is strictly bound by the commandment of the Lord; and for the good reason that every one should love Christ and his church infinitely more than his bodily parents, temporal goods, his own honour, or himself. It is moreover my opinion, that the glory of Christ, and of his bride the church, consist particularly in the practical imitation of the life of Christ himself in this, that a man lay aside all inordinate affections, and all human ordinances that would hinder or obstruct him in the pursuit of his object." He protests that he will never affirm anything contrary to the Holy Scriptures that contain Christ's law, or against his will. "And when I am taught, by any member of the church, or by any other creature whatsoever, that I have erred in my speech, I will openly and humbly retract it."

1 Et quamvis ipse Stanislaus magister meus exstiterit, a quo in suis exercitis et actibus scholasticis multa bona didici, tamen veritate instigante animum meum, cogor ad sua dicta, ut magis veritas appareat, utcunque dabitur, respondere. Resp. ad scr. Stanislai de Znoyma, opp. i. fol. 265, 1.

2 Quaestio de indulgentiis sive de cruciata papae Joannis XXIII. fulminata contra Ladislaum Apuliae regem, opp. i. fol. 174 seq.

"Therefore"—says he—"in order that I may proceed more safely, I will place myself on the immovable foundation, the corner stone, which is the truth, the way, and the life, our Lord Jesus Christ; and I hold it fast, as the faith of the church, that he who observes not the ordinance and the law which Christ established, and which he also taught and observed by himself and by his apostles, does not follow the Lord Jesus Christ in the narrow way that leadeth to life, but goes in the broad way which leads the members of the devil to perdition." Here Huss has laid down the principle by which he conceived himself bound to try all human ordinances, and the bulls of the popes as well. He maintains, on this principle, that it is not permitted the faithful to approve these bulls. Nothing but what proceeds from love, can be approved by Christ; but assuredly neither the shedding of blood among Christians, nor the laying waste and impoverishing of countries, can have proceeded from love to Christ; nor could such an enterprise afford any opportunity for martyrdom. He explains what is meant by "indulgence," holding to the term and sense in which it was no doubt understood in the papal bulls, and not going back to the original import of the old word *indulgentia*, viz., remission. Indulgence denotes the pardon of sin; which, in his view, was the work of God alone: but priestly absolution consisted in this, that the priest in the sacrament declared the person confessing to him to be in such a state of contrition as fitted him, if he died immediately, to enter, without passing through the fires of purgatory, into the heavenly mansions. And the power of the priest, in the last extremity, was not so restricted that he might not promise, so far as God who revealed it to him permitted, the pardon of sin; but it would be too great presumption to suppose that any vicar of Christ could rightfully attribute to himself such power of absolution, if God had never given him a special revelation on the subject; for otherwise he would be guilty of the sin of blasphemy. But how would it help the matter, supposing the subjects should clamorously demand such absolution; for assuredly they must believe that Christ, the most righteous judge, would judge them according to the measure of their merit or demerit. But though with Christ, who is present everywhere, contrition suffices, still the sacrament of penance is very necessary, though it can avail

nothing except on the presupposition of contrition. It was a foolish thing, therefore, for a priest not informed by divine revelation that penance or some other sacrament availed for the salvation of the individual to whom it was administered, to bestow on him unconditional absolution. "Hence the wise priests of Christ give only a conditional absolution, conditioned namely on the fact that the person confessing feels remorse for having sinned, is resolved to sin no more, trusts in God's mercy, and is determined for the future to obey God's commandments." Hence he argues that every one who receives such indulgence will actually enjoy it just so far as he is fitted to do so by his relation to God. He holds it to be the duty of prelates to instruct the people in this truth, so that the laity may not spend their time and labour on that which cannot profit them. He declares it to be allowable for a Christian man to contribute in aid of a war carried on by the secular power, if it be a Christian power; which implies that it be not waged for a mere earthly advantage, which the Christian should count as dross, but for the defence of the faith, to bring back to unity those with whom the war is carried on; or if this end is frustrated on their part, that charity should ever hold the reins, and the force of arms be employed only so long as might be necessary to open the way for reasonable negotiations. He next declares that it was neither permissible nor advantageous for a pope or for any bishop or clerk whatsoever, to fight for worldly dominion or worldly wealth. This might be understood from the example of Christ, whose vicar the pope was; for Christ did not fight, nor did he command his disciples to fight, but forbade them. He here cites the words of Christ, Luke xxii. 51. In the language of St Bernard, he maintains that the pope ought not to contend for secular things. Without doubt he may exhort princes to protect the faithful, by force, against the invasions of infidels or barbarians; but the secular sword belongs not to priests, but to the worldly profession of arms, the special intention of which is to defend the law of Christ, and of his church. But the safer way was to contend spiritually, not with the secular sword, but with prayer to almighty God, to persuade the enemy to concord by negotiations, even though by such a course, which to men might seem like madness, one should in case of need suffer death. This rule St Paul gives, in Rom. xii. 19;

"would that the pope might humbly adopt this rule of St Paul." He looked upon the pope's conduct as contrary to the example of Christ, who reprimanded his disciples for desiring to call down fire from heaven upon his enemies, Luke ix. 54. "O that the pope, then"—he says—"would, like the apostles, who desired to avenge their Lord, have addressed himself to the Lord, and with the cardinals said to him, Lord, if it be thy will, we would call upon all, of both sexes,[1] to combine for the destruction of Ladislaus and Gregory and their companions in guilt; and perhaps the Lord would have answered, Ye know not what spirit ye are of, when ye seek to ruin so many souls of men by ban, sentence of condemnation, and destruction of life. Why do ye thus set at nought my example, I who forbade my disciples to be so cruelly zealous against those that crucified me, who prayed, Father! forgive them, they know not what they do? If the pope, then, would subdue his enemies, let him follow the example of Christ, whose vicar he styles himself, let him pray for his enemies and the church; let him say, My kingdom is not of this world; let him show them kindness; let him bless those that curse him; for then will the Lord, according to his promise, give him a power of utterance and wisdom, which they will never be able to gainsay." Next, Huss noticed the objection of those who said, in those days, Such literal imitation of Christ is confined to the "evangelical counsels," designed for those that strive after Christian perfection,—for the monks. As we may conclude from several expressions of Huss already cited, he would doubtless have preferred to say that all Christians were bound to strive after the same; and instead of fighting with the secular sword, should contend only with the weapons of prayer and the word; but he was sensible that, in the present state of things, this was not to be looked for. He distinguishes, as we have already observed, the three different ranks of society; but he demands of the clergy that they at least should so deport themselves, as if they considered that to be a command for them which, to others, was only a counsel. All priests, he says, should aim at the highest perfection, because they are representatives of the apostles, and

[1] Alluding to an expression in the bull in which all persons of both sexes and of every rank, are called upon to furnish aid to the pope for destroying Ladislaus, and are promised, on this condition, the pardon of their sins.

particularly the pope, who should exhibit, in his conduct, the highest degree of perfection, after the example of Christ and of Peter. "All priests are bound to the same rule of perfection; certainly the priesthood is the summit of perfection in the militant church. The precepts, therefore, that forbid contention for earthly things, concern all priests in general." The clergy, according to him, should literally observe the precepts of the sermon on the mount; as, for example, Matt. v. 40, "from which it is evident"—he says—"that, although not to go to law about earthly matters, is for Christians of a *subordinate stage* a counsel, yet as applied to *priests* it changes, according to place and time, into a command. Ignorance in these matters is no excuse for a priest; because they are commanded, as persons ordained to act as presidents, judges, and teachers, to have knowledge of the law, and to explain it to those under them in all its several parts. This ignorance of holy Scripture, being a guilty ignorance, renders the priests the more condemnable, as it is the mother of all other errors and vices among themselves and the people." He then passes to the laity, and endeavours to show that if they followed the invitation of the bull, and by their contributions upheld the pope in things at variance with his calling, they could not wholly excuse themselves by pleading ignorance, since it was ignorance which they might doubtless have avoided; in fact it seemed that there was no such ignorance, but on the contrary, they had knowledge enough, only it was asleep; for when they saw priests attending spectacles, putting themselves on a par with the world, meddling in secular business, they directly murmured against them, in accordance with the Catholic tradition, though these were trifles when compared with carrying on war and legal suits for earthly ends. After showing that the laity were without excuse for their ignorance, which he ascribes, moreover, to the lack of a real interest in religion, he proceeds to speak of the absolute indifference which led many to obey the bull, who said, "What matters it to us, whether the bull is a good or a bad one? We can eat and drink without disturbance, if we are left to our peace; others may do what they please." He then comes to a third class, who obeyed from cowardice. And this reproach he casts particularly upon the theologians; men conversant with the Scriptures, who obeyed, he says, in opposition to their own

consciences, who thought of the bull in one way and spoke openly of it in another. "They tremble"—he says—"who should yield to no fear of the world; tremble lest they should lose their temporal goods, the honour of this world, or their lives." He then attacks the unchristian expressions in the bull, where it spoke of destroying Ladislaus to the third generation, in contradiction to Ezek. xviii. 20; where it calls Ladislaus and his adherents blasphemers and heretics, although this was not manifest from any trial to which *he* had been subjected, and although his subjects were included, poor weak people, men and women, acting under constraint. Referring to the definition above given of indulgence, he says: "On this point, he who is blind may judge, whether pardon of sin is not bestowed for a consideration in money." Is not this true simony? He then quotes some of the really scandalous language used by the papal commissioners for the sale of indulgences,—language well calculated to revolt every Christian feeling, as it had at first revolted even the feelings of Paletz—such expressions as the following: "By the apostolical power entrusted to me, I absolve thee from all the sins which, to God and to me thou hast truly confessed, and for which thou hast done penance. If, as thou art not able personally to take part in this enterprise, thou wilt act according to my direction, and that of the other commissioners in furnishing means and helps for this cause, and if thou hast done all according to thy ability, I bestow on thee the most perfect forgiveness of all thy sins, both from the guilt and the punishment of them, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Having first, not without reason, remarked that the words "as thou art not able," might probably contain a falsehood, Huss dwells more particularly on the blasphemous style in which absolution is declared. It was one and the same thing, he said, to bestow the forgiveness of all sins, and to impart the Holy Ghost. Both presupposed divine power. And for a sinful man to pretend to impart the Holy Ghost, was too enormous a presumption; for Christ alone, on whom the heavenly dove descended as a symbol of the Holy Ghost, could bestow the baptism of the Spirit. God grants the pardon of sin to none but those whom he has first rendered fit to receive it. Since then a Christian can render another person fit no otherwise than by labouring for it by

prayer or preaching, or by contributing to it through his own merits,[1] it was evident that the being rendered fit for it by God, must precede forgiveness. He then takes notice of a subterfuge: it might be said it was but a conditioned indulgence, given to the truly contrite, and therefore to the elect. This was sophistical. In this case there would be no need of indulgences. So, it might be said of any one that, on the supposition he was of the divine essence, he would be very God. He then takes notice of the sophistical pretence, that the pope's real object was neither more nor less than this, to rule the church of Christ in peace and tranquillity; but to secure this object, he must resist his adversaries. The pope could not deceive God. God knew perfectly on what the pope's heart was intent, his ruling aim *implicite* or *explicite*. And if he who should imitate the poverty of Christ, fought for worldly rule, he committed a grievous sin, of which every man was an abettor who upheld him in so doing. He thinks that if the pope really possessed a plenitude of power to bestow indulgence on all, Christian charity required no less of him than that he should show this kindness to all alike. Huss portrays the injurious effects produced by these indulgences. "The foolish man of wealth is betrayed into a false hope; the law of God is set at nought; the rude people give themselves up more freely to sin; grievous sins are thought lightly of; and, in general, the people are robbed of their property. Far be it, therefore, from the faithful to have anything to do with such indulgences." With regard to those expressions which referred to the common fund of all the good works in the church, to be distributed by the pope, Huss remarks: individuals share in this common fund only in proportion as they are qualified to share in it by their charity; but it is not in the power of the pope; it belongs to God alone to determine the greater or less degree of charity in individuals; for to do this presupposes infinite power; it depends on the good pleasure of God. Therefore it is not in the power of the pope to give any one a share in intercessions by the community of holy church; and consequently it was absurd for him to attribute any such power to himself, since the pope himself should, with David, humbly say, "Make

1 Orando, praedicando, merendo.

me, O God, a companion of all them that fear thee, and of them that keep thy precepts. In place of such an imparting of spiritual fellowship with all the good in the church, Huss would rather substitute this: Let the Christian live a righteous life, following Christ his head in all virtue, and especially in humility and patience; and then let him rely on partaking of his merits, so far as God may grant it, and assuredly if he thus perseveres unto the end, he will attain to the most complete forgiveness of his sins; and as his life grows conformed to the example of Christ, in the same proportion will he share of his mercy and of the glory of the blessed." He says that, from the proclamations of the commissioners for granting indulgences, it was evident that their sole object was to extort money from the people. Not an instance was to be found in Scripture of a holy man saying to any one, I have forgiven thee thy sins; I absolve thee. Nor were any to be found who had absolved from punishment or guilt for a certain number of days. The theological faculty, who said that, hundreds of years ago, the holy fathers instituted indulgences, had taken good care not to express themselves more definitely, and to say, a thousand years, two or three hundred, or any other particular number of centuries ago. Nor had they ventured to name any of these holy fathers. He will not allow that the sentence of the pope is an ultimate and definitive one; Christ is the highest expounder of his own law, as well by his words as by his deeds; and he is ever with his faithful, according to his promise that he would be with them even unto the end of the world. He then points to examples of uneducated and ignorant popes, not omitting to notice the fabulous pope Joan. He disputes the position, that when the great mass of the clergy, monks, and laity have approved of the papal bulls, it would be foolish to contradict so large a majority. By the same sort of reasoning, anything might be justified, however wicked and vile, provided only that it was approved by the majority; and anything condemned, however true and good, if sanctioned only by a minority. He quotes, in illustration, Jer. viii. 10; according to the principle above stated, it was folly in the prophet to contradict so vast a multitude. "Therefore"—says he—"it is the custom of wise men, whenever difficulties occur with regard to any truth, laying it open for discussion, to consider, first of all,

what the faith of holy Scripture teaches on the point in question; and whatever can be so determined, that they hold fast as a matter of faith. But if holy Scripture decides neither on one side nor the other, they let the subject alone, as one which does not concern them, and cease to dispute whether the truth lies on this side or that." In resisting the authority of the pope, Huss was accused of having resisted the ordinance of God, according to Rom. xiii. To this he replies: The charge is true, if by the authority of the pope is meant his authority as ordained of God; but it is false so far as it relates to the pretended and arrogated authority of the pope.[1]

After Huss had thus attacked the papal bulls with arguments calculated to impress every thinking mind that lay open to the truth, his friend Jerome came foward and delivered a glowing discourse, which kindled the greatest enthusiasm in the hearts of the youth. In the evening he was escorted home, in triumph, by large bodies of the students.[2] The excitement produced by the transactions of this day spread further; and, as it usually happens when the impulse has been given to some great movement, however pure and unobjectionable at the outset, that it no longer stands in the power of those who began it, to control and keep it within bounds, but violent passions soon enter in, and with their fierce burnings vitiate the purity of the beginning, so it turned out on the present occasion. Jerome of Prague wanted the prudence and moderation of Huss. A mock procession was got up; the papal bulls, suspended from the necks of certain indecent women, were carried, in the midst of a vast concourse of people, through the principal quarters of the city. The chariot conveying the women was surrounded by armed men of

1 The abbot of Dola, who accuses Huss also as a contemner of indulgences, scruples not to signalise these indulgences, which, in the period of which we are writing, were the occasion of so much mischief, as Romanae sedis consuetas et salutares indulgentias, and he ascribes the force supposed to reside in them to the merit of Christ's passion. Dialog. volatilis, Pez thesaur. iv. 2, pag. 474.

2 At the second hearing of Jerome of Prague at Constance, the subject was also brought up of his attack at this time on indulgences. Being asked what he held concerning indulgences, he declared, the indulgences of the pope and cardinals were legal, and such could be bestowed—wherein it was still left doubtful what notion he framed to himself of indulgences, and to what extent he would allow them—but a purchased indulgence, an indulgence made a matter of barter and sale by sellers of indulgences, quaestuarii was no indulgence at all, but an abuse of indulgences. V. d. Hardt, iv. 2, pag. 752 et 753.

the party, vociferating, "To the stake with the letters of a heretic and rogue!" In this way the bulls were finally conveyed to the Pranger, where a pile of faggots had been erected, upon which they were laid and burned. It was intended as a parody on the burning of Wicklif's books two years before.[1] That every foolish proceeding ought not to be laid to the charge of Huss, which the passionate leader of his adherents undertook, that he was far from approving of all that these persons either did or said, is evident from his own words in many of his letters, plainly intimating his dissatisfaction with many who professed to be of his party, but whose life did not correspond with the doctrines they supported, and his disapprobation of the violent language employed by many of his adherents. Thus, in reply to Paletz, who had accused him of apostacy from the whole faith of Christendom, he says, "Verily, if I allowed this to be true of myself and of my Christian brethren, I should be as false as he is; for I hope, by the grace of God, that I am a Christian, departing in no respect from the faith, and that I should prefer to suffer a horrible death rather than to affirm anything contrary to the faith, or to transgress the commandments of our Lord Jesus Christ. And the same I hope also of many of my adherents, though I observe with deep pain that some of them are blameworthy in their morals."[2] He also says, in this tract against Paletz, with regard to the abusive language which he used towards his adversaries, whom he styled heretics, "Hitherto I have used no such language as this against my adversaries; and I should be sorry if any one of my party should brand

1 We join what we find stated in the articles of complaint against Jerome of Prague, in Constance (V. d. Hardt iv. 2, pag. 672), with Palatzy's representation, who appeals to the manuscript report of a student, who had himself borne a part in the procession, (Palatzy iii. 1, p. 278). At the council of Constance (where, however, the year 1411 is erroneously put down by V. d. Hardt, as it must have been the year 1412) Jerome of Prague is designated as the getter up of this whole thing. But, Palatzy proves from the manuscript articles of complaint laid before the council of Constance against King Wenceslaus, (iii. 1, p. 277 note) that not Jerome of Prague, but Woksa, of Waldstein, one of Wenzel's favourites, was the author of this buffoonery, though Jerome may not have been averse to it. Hence it is evident, that Jerome said nothing untrue, when on his second hearing at Constance he asserted, that *he* did not burn the bull, (V. d. Hardt iv. 2, pag. 753).

2 Quamvis dolenter percipio aliquos in more deviare. Resp. ad scr. Paletz, opp. i. fol. 260, 1.

his opponent as a heretic, or style him a Mohammedan, or ridicule or attack him in any other way that implied a disregard to the law of love."[1] Alluding to the same person, he says, in another place: He holds us all to be Wicklifites, and all therefore to be, in his opinion, reprobates; but I hope there is much which is good on both sides, and believe that there are sinners also on both sides; and it never was, nor will it ever be, agreeable to me, to hear any who should style the party opposed to them Mohammedans or seducers."[2] Great self-control and prudence were assuredly required to enable a man standing at the head of his party, in a time of such violent excitement, to judge so dispassionately of his opponents, including some who were once his friends, but who now indulged the most violent animosity towards him, and to pass so severe a criticism on the conduct of his own party. We cannot fail to recognize here the spirit of Him who knew how to distinguish blasphemers against the Son of man from blasphemers against the Holy Ghost. And this is one trait which distinguishes Huss from Wicklif.

The co-political ecclesiastical motives which governed King Wenceslaus did not leave him at liberty to contemplate these movements any longer without disquietude, though it was already too late to think of putting a stop to them by a single enactment. As the king had approved the papal bull, had ordered it to be proclaimed, and permitted the preaching of indulgences; as he wished to maintain a good understanding with Pope John, he must look about for the means of asserting and carrying out what he had begun. He summoned around him the lords of counsel and the elders of the communities of all the three towns out of which the great capital had arisen, and directed them to forbid for the future all public insult of the pope, as well as all public resistance of the papal bulls, on pain of death, and to be vigilantly careful that all occasions of excitement on both sides should be avoided. This royal edict was proclaimed by a herald

1 Et doleo, cum aliquis de parte nostra aliquem haereticat vel appellat Mahometistam, vel aliter infamat aut impugnat caritatis regula praetermissa. Ibid. fol. 262, 2.

2 Ego autem ex utraque parte spero esse multos bonos, et ex utraque etiam parte aestimo esse peccatores, nec unquam mihi placuit, imo nec placebit, quod quidam vocant doctoris partem Mahometistas vel seductores. Ibid. fol. 264, 1.

through the whole city as a warning to all.[1] It is probable, however, that the king after all was not so very solicitous that these measures should be rigorously executed in their whole extent; nor is it clear that he had power enough to enforce them. The getter up of the mock procession against the bull of which we have just spoken still retained his relations with the king.[2] Huss could not be prevented by any power on earth from fulfilling his vocation as a preacher of the gospel, and from saying to his congregation whatever his duty as a preacher and curer of souls made it incumbent on him to say. He could not keep silent concerning the errors connected with the subject of indulgences; he must point out the great peril to which a reliance on indulgences, as he had already demonstrated in his public disputation, exposed the souls of the people. And yet Queen Sophia did not cease her attendance at the chapel of Huss; and this new contest could only serve to increase the number of his hearers and their enthusiasm. The large concourse of noblemen, knights, men and women of all ranks and conditions, who assembled around Huss, is described by his opponents; especially the thousands of pious women who were denominated Beguines—a nick-name like the term Pietists in later times; and one which had been applied already to the followers of Militz.[3] Now, when the hearts of the laity, of men who belonged to the class of industrious artisans, among whom Huss had many adherents, were seized by the power of truth in his sermons, and then going into the churches heard the sellers

1 Palatzy iii. 1, p. 278, and Steph. Dolanus in his Antihussus: Dum enim Wenceslaus regio suae potestatis imperio constituisset etiam voce praeconis per civitatem Pragensem decreto publico, ut nequaquam aliquis audeat rebellare et contradicere occulte vel publice sub capitali poena indulgentiis papalibus cuct. Pez iv. 2, pag. 380.

2 Palacky, iii. 1, p. 278.

3 See above, p. 247. The words of the abbot of Dola in Antihussus: Nobilibus, militaribus, plebeiis, mulieribus, tuorum tibi conceptuum cumulum multiplicas. Pez iv. 2, pag. 390. The Beguines are mentioned, as followers of Huss, in Antihussus, Pez iv. 2, p. 381, and in Dial. volat., ibid. pag. 492. In the trial at Prague, we learn that over 3000 persons met around Huss in the Bethlehem chapel. Vid. Depos. test. in the Stud. u. Krit. 1837, 1, p. 147. It was thrown out as a reproach against Huss, that he had no congregation of his own, but drew hearers to him from other parishes, and away from other parish priests. But to this he replied: No man was bound to listen to God's word nowhere else except in his own parish-church; for else no monk could ever preach, and no parish priest or parish vicar could allow persons belonging to other parishes to hear the word of God in his own church. Ibid. p. 146.

of indulgences preaching up with shameless effrontery the value of their spiritual merchandize, in direct outrage to the gospel truth they had listened to in Bethlehem chapel, nothing else was to be expected, especially in a state of so much excitement among the youth, than that violent scenes should ensue.

A number of priests, distributed among the several parish churches, were engaged, on the 10th of July, in publishing the papal bulls and inviting the people to purchase indulgences. On this occasion three young men belonging to the class of common artisans, by the name of John, Martin, and Stasek, stepping forward, cried out to one of these preachers, "Thou liest! Master Huss has taught us better than that. We know it is all false." After a while they were seized, conducted to the council-house, and, on the next day, in pursuance of the royal edict,[1] condemned to death. Huss, on being informed of this, felt it to be his duty to interpose and endeavour to save these young men, doomed to fall victims to the gospel truth which they had heard from his lips, and which burned in their hearts. Accompanied by 2000 students he repaired to the counsel house. He demanded a hearing for himself and some of his attendants. At length he was permitted to appear before the senate. He declared that he looked upon the fault of those young men as his own, and that he, therefore, much more than they, deserved to die. They promised him that no blood should be shed, and bade him tranquillize the excited feelings of the others. Hoping that they would keep their word, he left the counsel house together with his followers.[2]

1 It is noticeable that when Dr Nas of Prague had testified against Huss at his trial in Constance, that he himself was present cum rex mandasset, blasphemos ultimo supplicio affici, Huss directly declared this to be false. Yet, after what has been said, it cannot be doubted, that the king did issue such an edict against the disputers of indulgences. There was something then, we know not what, perhaps, in the form of that testimony, which led Huss to express himself in this way. Third hearing of Huss in Constance, V. d. Hardt iv. 2, p. 327.

2 The Abbot of Dola relates the transaction as follows: Facto siquidam praedictorum rebellium justo animadversionis excidio, accessisti vel misisti pluribus vallatus sociis ad maturum et discretum magnae civilis prudentia Pragensium consulum concilium, et praedicatione pompatica ausus es clamosa voce, nonsolum ipsorum debitam executionem, sed et regiam et in hoc omnino sanctam maturi decreti jussionem, non solum reprehendere, sed et damnare in quo utique crimen laesae majestatis perpetrasti, asserente te et dicente: Injuste illi damnati sunt; ego feci et ego feram. Ecce ego et omnes qui mecum sunt parati sumus eandem excipere sententiam. Steph. Dol. in Antihussus, Pez, iv. 2, pag. 380 et 381.

But some hours afterwards, when the multitude had, for the most part, dispersed, they ventured to proceed to the execution of the sentence. Resistance being apprehended from the Hussite party, the prisoners were conducted under a large escort of soldiers to the place of death, and, as in the meantime, the concourse of spectators running together in the highest state of excitement, increased every moment, they hurried the execution, and finished it even before arriving at the destined spot. But the adherents of Huss had no intention of resorting to violence. When the headsman, after his work was done, cried out, "Let him who does the like expect to suffer the same fate," many among the multitude exclaimed at once: "We are all ready to do the like and to suffer the same." This execution could have no other effect than to increase the excitement of feeling and the enthusiasm of the people for the cause of Huss. Those three young men would of course be regarded by the party they belong to as martyrs for the truth. It would be impossible to devise anything better calculated to promote any cause, bad or good, than to give it martyrs. Several, and in particular the so called Beguines of this party, of whom we have spoken above, dipped their handkerchiefs in the blood of the victims, and treasured them up as precious relics.[1] A woman who witnessed the execution offered white linen to enshroud the dead bodies; and another individual who was present, Master von Jitzin, attached to the party of Huss, hastened with a company of students to convey the bodies to Bethlehem chapel. Borne thither as saints, with chanted hymns and loud songs, they were buried amid great solemnities, under the direction of Huss. This event gave new importance to Bethlehem chapel in the eyes of the party of Huss. They named it the chapel of the three saints.[2] It is certain that Huss took a lively interest in the death of these young men. He thought they might justly be called martyrs for Christian truth, like others whose memory is preserved in the history of the church. Nor was there any thing in this which could justly subject him to the slightest reproach. Certainly by his sermons

[1] Words of the Abbot of Dola: Ut illorum sanguinem linteis, maxime beginae tunc et quidam alii, extergerent. Ibid. pag. 381.

[2] Ita ut te largiente et te donante locus ille tuae cathedrae summus non jam Bethlehem, sed ad tres sanctos per te et tuos complices vocaretur. Ibid.

he contributed to nourish the enthusiasm with which the memory of these witnesses for the truth was cherished among the people. But as public rumour, in such times of commotion, is not wont to discriminate between the different agents, and the different shares taken by each in a transaction, but is inclined to lay the whole upon the shoulders of the one who happens to be the most important individual, so Huss soon came to be pointed out as the person who headed the procession at the burial of the three young men. This is reported by the Abbot of Dola.[1] Accordingly the blame of the whole affair is thrown upon Huss at the Council of Constance; but he could deny, with truth, that the procession had been got up at his instigation.[2] It is indeed possible, though the statement of so violent an opponent as the Abbot of Dola cannot be received as altogether trustworthy, that it was remarked by Huss or some one of his followers: If that Wenceslaus, whom his brother, Boleslav, the cruel, caused to be executed, deserved to be called a martyr, much more were those three young witnesses to evangelical truth entitled to be honoured as martyrs; or that Huss, following the precedent of Matthias of Janow, spoke disapprovingly of the superstition and quackery with which the traffic in relics, whether genuine or counterfeit, was carried on; or that, one of his adherents had said, the bones of these three, who ought certainly to be reverenced as witnesses for the truth, must be more precious to the memory of the pious than those relics that were held to be present at one and the same time in several places.[3] But we may hear what Huss him-

1 Accessisti siquidem et jacentia rebellium corpora sub mediastino sustulisti: et cum ea, quae tibi videbatur, summa reverentia ad cathedram tuae superbiae, capellam dictam Bethlehem detulisti; te ipso et scholaribus tuae societatis, sanctae, obedientiae contrariis, clamosis et altissimis vocibus usque ad inferni novissima concrepantibus: Isti sunt sancti, et hujusmodi plurima. Ibid. This serves to confirm the account given above of the solemnities observed in conveying the bodies of those three young men to Bethlehem chapel, except that the abbot makes no distinction of persons, and charges Huss *alone* with the whole affair.

2 At the council of Constance this also was introduced among the articles of complaint against Huss, regarding the burial of the three young men: Eos per eundem Hus cum pompa scholasticorum elatos et publica concione in sanctorum numerum relatos esse. But Huss declares this to be false, as he was not present when the affair occurred: Falsum est, cadavera a me ad sepulturam cum aliqua pompa delata esse, cum ego ne adfuerim quidem. V. d. Hardt iv. 2, pag. 327.

3 They are the words of the abbot of Dola: Venerationem sanctorum ossium juxta ritum ecclesiae sanctae cum tuis reprobas dicens, quod S. Wenceslaus modico martyrio, id est fratricidio regnum promeruit martyrii: et hic cum aliis sanctis, quos

self says concerning these witnesses of the truth, as his words are recorded in his book *De Ecclesia*, written at a somewhat later period. After citing the passage in Dan. xi. 33, he remarks; "Experience gives us the right interpretation of these words,—, since persons made learned by the grace of God, simple laymen and priests, many taught by the example of a good life, because they openly resisted the lying word of antichrist, have fallen under the edge of the sword; of which we have an example in those three laymen, John, Martin, and Stasek, who, because they contradicted the lying disciples of antichrist, fell victims to the sword." Then, in allusion to what afterwards transpired in consequence of these commotions, he adds: "But others who gave up their lives for the truth, died the death of martyrs, or were imprisoned, and still have not denied the truth of Christ, priests, and laymen, and even women."[1]

This first blood having been shed, the persecuting party thought it inexpedient to venture immediately upon any thing further. They perceived the danger of attempting to put a stop to these commotions by force. They had learned by experience to what a height the enthusiasm of the people had already mounted by the death of those three young men. Accordingly the other prisoners, who were now looking for nothing but martyrdom, were set at large. The conflict between the two parties, which had divided the university, since the dispute about the papal bulls relating to indulgence and a crusade, still went on, and grew more violent; the smaller party, consisting of those who now declared themselves opposed to all Wicklifite doctrines and in favour of the whole system of papal absolutism, and the larger party of those, who espoused the cause of reform, at the head of whom stood Huss. The former had on their side all who were attached to the hierarchy; and they supposed they could reckon also on the help of King Wenceslaus, whom, in fact, they had joined on defending the bull, and who had issued the edict against its opponents. Those eight doctors, at whose head stood at that time Paletz, as Dean, believed they were en-

sacerdotes et monachi praedicant, habent unius multa capita, multa bracchia et diversa ossa, quae utique non sanctorum, sed vilium cadaverum esse potius reputantur. Ibid.

1 De ecclesia, opp. i. fol. 245, 2.

titled to represent themselves as constituting the theological faculty. They now united in condemning the 45 articles of Wicklif, although some of them had before this defended those articles; and, hence, Huss calls them the *cancrisantes*. They declared to the prelates their agreement with them in the earlier resolutions against those articles: and, by a course which to Huss appeared retrograde, though to the advocates of hierarchy it could appear no otherwise than an advance, gave them the highest satisfaction. They next proceeded to condemn the 45 articles in a solemn session.[1] To these propositions they added six others. 1. "That he is a heretic who judges otherwise than the Roman church concerning the sacraments and the spiritual power of the keys," which doubtless refers to the proceedings of Huss against indulgences. 2. "That in *these* days, to suppose that great antichrist is present and rules, who, according to the faith of the church, and according to Holy Scripture, and the holy teachers, shall appear at the end of the world, is shown by experience to be a manifest error." This refers to the doctrine concerning antichrist, which, as we have seen, proceeded first from Militz, had been further unfolded by Matthias of Janow, and so passed over to Huss. 3. "To say that the ordinances of the holy fathers, and the praiseworthy customs in the church, are not to be observed, because they are not contained in Holy Scripture, is an error." This is evidently directed against a doctrine of Huss, which we have explained on a former page. 4. "That the relics, the bones of the saints, the clothes and robes of the faithful are not to be reverenced, is an error. 5. "That priests cannot absolve from sins and forgive sins, when, as ministers of the church, they bestow and apply the sacrament of penance, but that they only announce that the penitent is absolved, is an error." This also plainly enough refers to the doctrine set forth by Huss in the controversy about indulgences. 6. "That the pope may not, where it becomes necessary, call upon the faithful or demand contributions of them for the defence of the Apostoli-

1 Huss says of Paletz: Recepit articulos, qui sunt praelatis contrari et cucurrit ad eos, qui gavisi sunt videntes ipsum et Stanislaum cancrisantes. Unde initio consilio pactum fecerunt invicem, ut articulos in praetorio condemnarent. Resp. ad. scr. Paletz, opp. i., fol. 259, 2. This is the condemnation in praeterio to which Huss in his writings subsequent to this time in defence of these articles often alludes.

cal See, of the Roman church and city and for the coercion and subjection of opponents and enemies among Christians, while he bestows on the faithful who loyally come to the rescue, show true penitence, have confessed and are mortified, the full forgiveness of all sins, is an error."[1] Huss represents it as a piece of arrogance in those eight doctors to think themselves entitled to act in the name of the entire faculty, and to put forth their condemnation as a condemnation by the whole faculty.[2] Now, as this party could not reckon, as appears evident from what has been said, on the concurrence of the whole university, and therefore could not take any open step in common, they, as the theological faculty, applied to the magistracy of Prague, and petitioned them to obtain the king's consent, that the teaching and spreading abroad of those articles should be forbidden by a royal edict. This theological faculty had, moreover, declared that certain preachers, on whose account violent insurrections, strifes, and divisions had sprung up among the people, ought to be silenced. And they stated, as their last reason, that this was the way to restore peace among the people.[3] A cunningly devised means, to be sure, for putting an end to all strife, to allow only one party to speak, and enjoin absolute silence on the other. Such an edict was now to be procured from the king.[4] The king granted but a part of the demand. He actually issued an edict, forbidding the preaching of those doctrines on penalty of banishment from the land; at the same time, however, he caused the faculty to be told, that they had better employ themselves in refuting those doctrines, than in trying to effect the suppression of

1 We cite the unprinted articles from the Latin original published by Palacky. Palacky iii. 1, p. 282.

2 He protests against their arrogance in calling themselves the alma et venerabilis facultas theologica, and prefers to designate them as the octo doctores, remarking in his tract against Stanislaus: Est autem illa facultas theologica, quae aciem contra nos dirigit, magistrorum theologiae octonarius. Resp. ad scr. Stanisl. a Znoyma. opp. i., fol. 265, 1.

3 Quod certi praedicatores, propter quos, ut timetur, insultus et discordiae et dissensiones sunt exortae in populo, cessent a praedicatione. Et adducunt in fine pro causa: Et speratur, quod per hoc fiet pax in populo et insultus conquiescent, Resp. ad scr. Stanislai, opp. i., fol. 266, 2.

4 Huss remarks concerning this design of the faculty: "Behold a design of these doctors similar to that of those priests and Pharisees; and both cases resulted in the same way, for neither did the former nor the latter secure the peace which they sought, but were in more trouble than before. And, rightly; for the Truth did not come to bring peace upon the earth but a sword: and never ought we to be frightened away from the truth by fear of reproach from the world or from the doctors." Ibid.

them by an edict of prohibition. But an edict of prohibition against the preaching of this or that individual, was a thing he would never consent to. As the faculty could not fail to see the reproach implied in this language of the king, they sought to justify what they had done, affirming that for them to refute those doctrines was impossible as long as Huss refused to lay before them in a written form as they had requested him to do, what he had to object against the two bulls.[1] When Huss was now summoned to appear with his opponents before the king's privy council, in Zebrak, he first appealed to the words of Christ before the High Priest (John xviii. 20), and applying them to his case, remarked: "I have spoken openly, and taught in the schools, and in the temple in Bethlehem, where masters, bachelors, students, and multitudes of the common people congregate, and nothing have I spoken in secret, by which I could be seeking to draw men away from the truth." At the same time he declared that he was ready to comply with the demand of those doctors, provided that, as he bound himself to suffer at the stake, in case he could be convicted of holding any erroneous doctrine, the eight doctors would also *on their part* collectively bind themselves to suffer in the same way on the same condition. They requested time for deliberation and withdrew; then they came forward and said, that one of them would bind himself by this pledge for all. To this, however, Huss would not consent, but declared, as they were all combined together against him, and he stood opposed to them without associates, this would not be fair.[2] Finding that the two parties would never be able to agree in settling the preliminary arrangements, the privy council dissolved the meeting, having first admonished both that they should try to make up the matter between themselves[3]—an admonition which, in their present state of exasperated feeling, would pass unheeded, and which was intended, perhaps, simply to intimate that the council would have nothing more to do with the business.

The consequences which had followed in the train of the dispute about indulgences, could easily be taken advantage of to

1 Quod non stat per magistros theologiae, quod nihil scribitur et non est scriptum contra dicta M. Joannis Hus de bullis papae, quia saepius requisitus, dictorum suorum non dedit copiam, nec hucusque dare voluit magistris supradictis.—So the words run in a manuscript copy cited by Palacky iii. 1, p. 281.

2 Refut. scripti octo doct., opp. i., fol. 292, 2.

3 Concordetis pulchre invicem. Ibid.

represent Huss, in Rome, as a dangerous man, hostile to the papacy. His enemies at home found a worthy instrument to play their first cards at the Roman court, in Michael of Deutschbrod, formerly a parish priest, commonly known as Michael de Causis, parochial priest to St Adalbert's church in the New City in Prague. This man, more interested about reforms in mining than reforms in the church, had left his charge and entered the service of the king to carry out a project for the improvement of mining by some new method of exploring veins of gold. The king, induced by certain representations he had laid before him, gave him a sum of money to be expended on this object. But failing to accomplish what he had promised about improvements in mining, he absconded with a part of the money, getting still more from the enemies of Huss, to assist them in carrying out their designs against the latter by bribery, an all-powerful agent with the creatures of that monster Pope John, though hardly needed to secure the ruin of a man who had shown himself so hostile as Huss had done to the Roman papacy. Before the pope was yet informed of all that had transpired in Prague, he had taken the case of Huss out of the hands of Cardinal Brancas, to whom it had last been committed, and given it over to another cardinal, Peter de St Angelo, charging him to employ the severest measures against the recusant. Upon this, the procurators of Huss appealed to a future general council, and were immediately placed under arrest. The friend of Huss, Master Jesenic, made his escape and got back to Prague. The Cardinal now pronounced sentence of excommunication on Huss, in the most terrible formulas. If he persisted twenty days in his disobedience to the pope, the ban was to be proclaimed against him in all the churches, on Sundays and festival days, with the ringing of all the bells and the extinguishing of all the tapers, and the same punishment should be extended to all who kept company with him. The interdict should be laid on every place that harboured him. By a second ordinance of the pope, the people of Prague were called upon to seize the person of Huss, and deliver him up to the Archbishop of Prague, or to the bishop of Leitomysl, or to condemn and burn him according to the laws. Bethlehem chapel was to be destroyed from its foundation, that the heretics might no longer nestle there.[1] King Wen-

[1] See the Chron. univ. Prag., cited from the manuscript in Palacky iii. 1, p. 286.

ceslaus offered no resistance to the proclamation of these papal ordinances; at the same time he did nothing to promote their execution. The party opposed to Huss would have been eager therefore to carry the whole into effect, had they been powerful enough to do so. With the concurrence of the senators in the Old City of Prague, the majority of whom were still Germans, and therefore opponents of Huss, many citizens, who were also Germans, assembled at the consecration festival of the church of Prague, Oct. 2, under Bernhard Chotek, a Bohemian, as their leader, for the purpose of dispersing the congregation in Bethehem chapel and getting possession of the person of Huss. But the firm resolution with which they were met by the congregation who gathered around Huss, induced them to abandon their plan. They returned back to the senate house, where it was resolved at least to carry into execution the pope's command to destroy Bethlehem chapel. But when this resolution came to be known, such violent commotions arose, that it was found necessary to abandon this project also. The party of Huss did not allow itself to be intimidated by the pope's bull of excommunication. His procurator, Master Jesenic, to whom the pope's bull was extended, published on the 18th of December of this year, at the University of Prague, an argument which is still preserved, in which he undertook to demonstrate the invalidity of everything that had been done in the process against Huss. Huss himself could not, consistently with his own principles as they have been explained, attribute any significance to an unjust excommunication. He caused to be engraved on the walls of Bethlehem chapel a few words, showing the invalidity of such an excommunication, to which he several times refers; and finally, when no other earthly remedy was left him, he appealed from the venality of the court of Rome to the one incorruptible, just, and infallible judge, Jesus Christ. Already, in his tract against Stephen Paletz, he expresses himself on this subject in the following language. After describing what pains he had taken to obtain justice at the Roman chancery, he says: "But the Roman court, which cares not for the sheep without the wool, would never cease asking for money, therefore have I finally appealed from it to the most just Judge and High Priest over all."[1] This appeal he published to his congregation from

1 Opp. i. fol. 256, 1.

the pulpit of Bethlehem chapel. It is characteristic of the times that this act should also be objected to him as a contemptuous trifling with the jurisdiction of the church, as an insolent act of disobedience to the pope, and an overleaping of the regular order of ecclesiastical tribunals. The abbot of Dola says, in his invective against Huss, "Tell me, then, who accepted your appeal? From whom did you obtain a release from the jurisdiction of the subordinate authorities? You would not say from the laity, and your daughters the Beguins."[1] The parish priests of Prague, however, paid no regard to all this, but only obeyed the pope; a course, too, which perfectly fell in with their own passions and interests. From all the pulpits they published the ban against Huss; they strictly observed the interdict; no sacraments were administered; no ecclesiastical burial was permitted. Such a state of things would, as ever, provoke the most violent disturbances among the people. The king himself, therefore, was urgent with Huss that, to preserve peace, he should leave Prague for a time. Archbishop Albic did not feel able to sustain the conflicts at Prague; nor did such kind of activity suit his love of repose. At the close of the year 1412 he laid down his office, and Conrad of Vechta, bishop of Olmutz, a Westphalian, a zealous advocate of the hierarchy, and more inclined to severe measures in support of it than his predecessor, obtained, first under the name of *ministrator*, the administration of the archbishopric of Prague, till finally, after long protracted negotiations with the Roman court, he became, in July 1413, archbishop in the full sense.

By the removal of Huss from Prague, quiet was by no means restored in Bohemia. His principles still continued to operate among his important party at Prague. There was a sharp opposition between the two parties, the Hussites and the church party. King Wenzel thought it wrong to allow the matter, which continually grew more serious, and involved in its train important political consequences, to go on thus any longer. The college of the ancient nobles of the land had already assembled before the Christmas of 1412, for the purpose of advising about

1 Dic ergo quaeso, quis detulit tuae appellationi? a quo petiisti dimissorias literas sive apostolos? Nonne a laïcis et filiabus tuis beginis? Dial. volat. Pez iv. 2, pag. 492.

the restoration of peace and the rescue of the good name of the Bohemian people in foreign lands. The assembling of a national synod for this purpose, before which the leaders of the two parties should appear, was resolved upon. At first the little city Bohmisch-Brod, which belonged to the archbishop of Prague, was selected for the place of meeting, since it was thought that the appearance of Huss in this small city, notwithstanding the ban under which he lay and the interdict on his place of residence, would create little or no disturbance. Here the proposals of the two parties were to be investigated. On the one side were the Prague theological faculty of the eight doctors, at whose head were Stephen of Paletz and Stanislaus of Znaim, with archbishop John the Iron, of Leitomysl; on the other side, John Huss. But in the memorials drawn up by the two parties, nothing appeared but the most diametrical opposition of principles. The theological faculty traced all the schism to the defending of the forty-five erroneous doctrines of Wicklif, and insisted that the condemnation of them should be rigorously observed, and that the decision of the church of Rome should be submitted to in every point. The church in their view was the pope as head, and the college of cardinals as the body. Errors they found, especially in the widely-spread doctrines about the power of the keys being vested in the church; errors concerning the hierarchy; concerning the seven sacraments; concerning the veneration of relics; and concerning indulgence. They traced all these errors to one cause, that the party admitted no other authority than the sacred Scriptures, explained in their own sense and in contrariety with the doctrine of the church and of entire Christendom. They regarded themselves, on the other hand, as the people, who alone were in possession of the truth, inasmuch as they agreed with the doctrine of the Roman church and of entire Christendom. They required in all matters in themselves indifferent, among which were to be reckoned the late ordinances of the pope and the process against Huss, unconditional submission to the Roman church. The disobedience of Huss and his party to the commands of their superiors passed, with them, for the greatest crime. The interdict should be strictly observed; the order forbidding Huss to preach, should remain in full force. They maintained that, since the proceed-

ings against Huss had been accepted by the collective body of the clergy of Prague, and *they* had submitted to them, therefore all should do the same, especially as they related only to things in themselves indifferent, forbade nothing *good*, and commanded nothing *wrong*; and it was not the business of the clergy of Prague to judge whether the ban pronounced on John Huss was a just or an unjust one. Severe punishment for publicly holding forth any of those things which they from their particular point of view called heresy, was required by them. Their proposals for peace, therefore, looked to nothing else than a total suppression of the other party and the triumph of their own. Huss, on the other hand, began by laying down the principle, that the sacred Scriptures alone should pass as a final authority; no obedience could be required to that which was at variance with their teaching. He said, in answer to the challenge of obedience to the interdict and ban: "It were the same as to argue that, because the judgment pronouncing Christ a traitor, an evil doer, and worthy of death, was approved by the collective body of the priests in Jerusalem, therefore that judgment must be acquiesced in."[1] Looking at the matter from this point of view, he was conscious of no heresy himself, nor could he see any ground for asserting that heresies existed in Bohemia. He demanded, therefore, that they should return back to the earlier compact concluded under archbishop Zbynek. He declared that he was ready to clear himself from the charge of heresy against any man, or else suffer at the stake, provided his accusers would also bind themselves under the same conditions. Every man who took it upon himself to accuse another of heresy, should be required to come forward and take this pledge. But if none could be found that were able to do so, then it should be proclaimed anew that heresy did not exist in Bohemia. The hierarchical party would naturally look upon all this as a mere shift to avoid the necessity of submitting to the church, and of giving up the defence of heresy. Archbishop John the Iron, of Leitomysl, approved the propositions of the other party, and declared strongly against those of the party of Huss. He advised that all writings in the vulgar language of Bohemia, relating to religious subjects, writings that had contri-

1 Opp. i., fol. 247, 2.

buted in a special manner to the spread of heresy, should be condemned, and the reading of them forbidden.[1] Where there was such contrariety in principles, as we here see manifested, it is evident that all attempts at compromise would necessarily prove idle, or only terminate in making the breach still wider. These transactions afforded Huss a good opportunity for more fully expounding and defending, in the tracts which he wrote in confutation of the propositions above stated, of the arrogant pretensions clearly avowed therein by the other party, and of the accusations brought against him and his friends, the principles which had guided him in these disputes, and which by occasion of these disputes became more distinctly evolved to his own consciousness. We shall state them more fully in the next section, where we shall recur to them for the purpose of a more distinct exposition of the doctrines and principles of Huss, and of their bearing on the aims and tendencies of the dominant party. The synod above-mentioned was not held, as at first intended, at Bohmisch-Brod, but in Prague itself, on the 6th of February, 1413. Huss therefore could not be present. His place was represented by his advocate, Master John of Jesenic. Before this synod were laid the propositions of the two parties. And here it should be mentioned, that one of the most zealous friends of Huss, Master Jacobellus of Mies, submitted a resolution to this effect: that if the matter now in question related to the restoration of peace, it should first be settled *what* peace was meant, whether peace with *the world*, or with *God;* the latter depended on keeping the divine commandments. The origin of the strife was this: that the attempts of some to bring back that peace of God met with such unholy and violent resistance on the part of others. Yet the peace of the world without Christian and divine peace, would be as unstable as it was worthless. Let the king but give his thoughts to the *latter* first, and the other would follow of itself.[2] The result of this synod was such as might be expected in a case where the direct contrariety of the propositions offered rendered compromise impossible. It broke up without having accomplished anything. But the king, who looked at nothing but the interests of his government, and there-

1 See the documents in Cochlæus, p. 29 sq., and Palacky iii. 1, p. 289 ff.

2 Palacky iii. 1, p. 293.

fore desired nothing but a peaceful compromise, tried yet another expedient. He appointed a committee composed of four members: the archbishop Albic, the Wysehrad dean Jacob, the provost of All-Saints Master Zbenek of Labaun, and the rector of the university Master Christann of Prachatic.[1] This committee was empowered to take every measure necessary for the restoration of concord and tranquillity. They carried it so far as to oblige the two parties to bind themselves under the penalty of a pecuniary forfeit and of banishment from the country, to abide by the decision of this committee. But the same reasons which had operated to defeat the purpose of the synod, would operate with equal force against this experiment also. No sooner did they proceed to reduce to form the first proposition, expressing the agreement of the two parties with the faith of the church on the matter of the holy sacraments and the authority of the church, than a dispute arose out of this, namely, that Paletz, who with his friends did not consider themselves as a party standing over against the others, but as defending the cause of the church against a party standing opposed to that cause, thought he could not concede, that he and his were also to be called a *pars*, a mere party. He then directly proceeded to lay down his definition of the church, a definition which the other party would not admit; against which indeed they had always protested, as is evident from the writings of Huss; a definition by admitting which the party of Huss would have surrendered all their principles; namely, that by the church is to be understood the body of cardinals under the pope as their head. Master John of Jesenic, who represented the party of Huss, finally yielded, but with the qualifying clause that he and his party accepted the decisions of the church as every faithful Christian ought to accept and understand them. Now by this clause the definition chosen with a purpose by the other party, was indeed, of itself, rendered impotent; for, under the phrase, "such acceptation as every believing Christian is bound to give," was meant to be understood, by those from whom this clause proceeded, that everything was excluded thereby which might stand at variance with their principle that the sacred Scriptures are the sole

1 Palacky iii. 1, p. 294.

determining rule of faith. The commission, who had no other interest in view than that of securing an agreement, and who were ready to welcome any terms of agreement however ambiguously expressed, would be satisfied with this. But looking upon the thing from their own point of view, the other party could not be blamed when they were led, by the same interest which had induced them to propose their narrow definition of the church, to protest against a clause by which their whole object would be defeated. Stanislaus of Znaim and Stephen Paletz declared that this was only a shift, a pretext, under which to conceal discord and disobedience. And in this, judged according to their own point of view, they were right. For two days they vainly disputed on this point. On the third, Paletz and the other doctors who had protested, wholly absented themselves, accusing the Commission of weakness and partiality. King Wenceslaus now looked upon the four members of the theological faculty, who by their protest had hindered the compromise, as the promoters of schism, being unfaithful to the pledge under which they had engaged to submit to the decision of the committee; and he deprived them of their places and banished them from the country. Thus fell the party which regarded itself as exclusively the party of the church. Another defeat awaited it. In the senate of Prague the German element had hitherto had the ascendancy; and it was in fact this element chiefly which resisted, in a decided manner, every tendency to reform; and hence those measures adopted by the senate against the cause of Huss, of which we have spoken before. But King Wenzel was now induced so to alter the relation, that out of the two races, Bohemians and Germans, all the nine members should be chosen into the senate by the king. At the same time a German, who had hitherto been a leader among the opponents of Huss, the senator John Oertel, was, for some unknown reason, executed. Thus another victory, if it might be called such, was gained by the Hussite party. But the hatred of the hierarchical party in Bohemia towards the Hussites would only be fanned, by such events, to more violent flame, and its organs subsequently obtained, by the concatenation of greater events in the progress of church development, an opportunity to exercise their revenge. Stanislaus of Znaim died, it is true, soon afterwards; but Paletz had the

satisfaction to appear as the fiercest accuser of Huss at the council of Constance. We now return back to the personal history of Huss.

He had in the meantime retreated to castles belonging to his friends; and, while the seed scattered by him in Prague was producing its fruits, he was enabled to prosecute at greater leisure the defence of his principles by writings. He spent the first part of the time chiefly at the castle, Kozi-hrádek, which belonged to the lords of Austie. Here he wrote the most important of all his works,—the one chiefly appealed to in conducting the process against him which brought him to the stake. This was his book *De ecclesia*, and the controversial writings therewith connected, tracts directed against the theological faculty in Prague, against Stephen Paletz, and against Stanislaus of Znaim,—writings, of which we have already availed ourselves in tracing the thread of the author's history, in explaining his principles and describing his labours, although in point of chronology they presuppose the work *De ecclesia*. It is characteristic of Huss, that precisely at this critical juncture, where the contest threatened to be most dangerous, he should unfold in this work *De ecclesia*, without regard to consequences, those doctrines which would inevitably most contribute to fix upon him the stigma of heresy. Accordingly, Cardinal D'Ailly remarked of this work, before the council of Constance, that through an endless multitude of arguments it attacked the papal authority and the plenitude of the papal power, as much as the Koran did the Catholic faith.[1] Huss in this work traces the origin of the whole dispute to his attacks of the secularized clergy. He distributes the entire body of the clergy into two classes: the *clerus Christi* and the *clerus Antichristi*. "We must regard the clerical body"—he says—"as made up of two sects: the clergy of Christ and those of antichrist. The Christian clergy lean on Christ as their leader, and on his laws. The clergy of antichrist lean for the most part or wholly on human laws and the laws of antichrist; and yet pretend to be the clergy of Christ and of the church, so as to seduce the people by a more cunning hypocrisy. And two sects which

1 Qui quidem liber per infinita argumenta ita impugnat auctoritatem papalem et ejus plenitudinem potestatis, sicut Alcoranus impugnat catholicam fidem. D'Ailly, de necessitate reformationis, in Works of Gerson, Tom. ii., p. 901.

are so directly opposed, must necessarily be governed by two opposite heads with their corresponding laws."[1] He says: "The priests of Christ preached against the vices of a corrupt clergy. Hence arose the schism, and hence that clergy sought to suppress such preaching." He says, "how can there be anything more senseless than a clergy giving themselves up to the dross of this world, and making a mockery of the life and teaching of Christ? For, so exceedingly corrupt are the clergy already, that they hate those who frequently preach, and frequently mention the Lord Jesus Christ; and, if a man ventures to quote Christ for himself, they say with scorn and bitterness, Art thou Christ? And, after the manner of the Pharisees, they trouble and excommunicate those who acknowledge Christ. It was because I preached Christ and the gospel, and exposed antichrist, anxious that the clergy should live according to the law of Christ, that the prelates first, with Archbishop Zbynek, contrived to get a bull from Pope Alexander V., to prohibit preaching in the chapels before the people, from which bull I had appealed: but I was never able to get a hearing. Therefore, on good and reasonable grounds, I did not appear when I was cited. Therefore, by the instrumentality of Michael de Causis, they got me placed under the ban, when a compromise had already been effected; and, finally, they contrived to obtain an interdict, by which they oppress the Christian people for no fault of their own." In accounting for his non-appearance in Rome he explains himself further, as follows: "What reason had I for obedience—a man summoned from a distance of 1200 miles. What reason that I, a man unknown to the pope, informed against by my enemies, should be so very solicitous and put myself to such extraordinary pains, to pass through the midst of my enemies, and place myself before judges and witnesses, who are my enemies, that I should use up the property of the poor to defray the enormous expenses, or if I could not meet the expenses, miserably perish from hunger and thirst? And what was to be gained by my appearance? One consequence certainly would be neglect of the work which God gave to me to do, for my own salvation and that of others. There I should be learning, not how to believe, but how to conduct a pro-

1 De ecclesia, opp. i., fol. 226, 1.

cess, a thing not permitted to a servant of God. There I should be robbed by the consistory of cardinals—made lukewarm in holy living; be betrayed into impatience by oppression; and, if I had nothing to give, must be condemned, let my cause be ever so good; and, what is still worse, I should be compelled to worship the pope on my bended knees." Appealing to the words inscribed on the walls at Bethlehem,[1] he mentions, as a reason why the pretended ban could not affect him, that his judges and witnesses at Rome were his enemies, and, in particular, that his judge was a party concerned in the cause.[2] "It is"—says he—"a great distance;—everywhere on this journey I should be surrounded by my enemies the Germans.[3] I see no advantage to be gained by my appearance; but the contrary;—I must neglect my people in the word of God. I hope Christ has warned against any such peril, when he says: Lo, I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye, therefore, wise as serpents and harmless as doves, (Matt. x. 16)." With regard to the interdict, he speaks of that as an unchristian thing in itself. He traces its origin to the twelfth century, under Pope Hadrian IV., who, for some ill-treatment or other of a cardinal, laid an interdict on the place where Arnold of Brescia resided—which, to be sure, is not strictly correct—and he remarks: "O, how patient was that pope; but yet not like Christ, and the apostles,

[1] Et si non vis credere, disce in Bethlehem in pariete, ibi reperies, quomodo justo non nocet excommunicatio, sed proficit, et quare debet etiam justus timere excommunicationem injustam praelaticam vel Pilaticam. Fol. 249, 2.

[2] Judicem principaliter tangit causa. Fol. 244, 2.

[3] The naive manner in which the abbot of Dola labours to refute these arguments, reproaching Huss with cowardice, exhorting him to trust in God and fear nothing, and holding up to him the example of Christ when he appeared before Pilate, is quite characteristic. We will quote a specimen of his fine logic: Ecce cum necdum audieris proelia et seditiones, jam contra Christi exhortationem stolide terreris. Et ubi sermo sapientiae: Pro justitia certa usque ad mortem? Et tu dices te intrepidum praedicatorem esse pro veritate exponenda (quae veritas Christus est), qui etiam, ubi non est timor, times mortem? Numquid commortuus fuit in te sermo dominicus: Nolite timere eos, qui corpus occidunt; animam autem non possunt occidere? Numquid legisti: Quis accusabit adversus electos dei? Deus, qui justificat; quis est qui condemnet? Ad curiam citatus debuisti potius humiliter parere et cum apostolo dicere: Si deus pro nobis, quis contra nos? Ecce deus proprio filio suo non pepercit, sed pro nobis omnibus tradidit illum, etiam judicandum impio judici Pilato, numquid tu major es Christo? Christus pro nobis non refugit judicari ab iniquo judice: et tu contemnis, imo condemnas pro expurgandis tuis propriis peccatis judicium summi pontificis, vicarii Jesu Christi? Dial. volat. Pez iv. 2, pag. 465 et 466

Peter, Paul, and Andrew." "Perhaps"—says he afterwards—"that language of the Roman court is founded upon the exhortation: We ought always to pray and not faint, (Luke xviii. 1); or, on the words: Praise the Lord, all ye people, (Ps. cxvii. 1). But what would the people say who hold such language should it happen that John Huss arrives at the city of the heavenly Jerusalem, where cherubim and seraphim cease not daily to cry with one voice: 'Holy is our God?' Will these on account of the papal bull cease to praise God, so that Christ, the true intercessor with God, must cease to intercede in behalf of the faithful his members?"

Though Huss was very far from harbouring any intention to found a new church, or to renounce the church of that time, yet the principle from which such a renunciation would necessarily follow, was, it must be owned, sharply expressed and clearly unfolded in this book and the controversial tracts which, as we have said, were connected with it. From the direct unmediated reference of the Christian consciousness to the Saviour, such as we find in these works, results already a new and more spiritual conception of the church, another conception of the necessity of the church unity, opposed to the theory of a necessary visible head. Already, we find, in its germ, the distinction of visible and invisible church. In reference to this last, it is only necessary to remark, that Huss, taking his start from the strict Augustinian system—though his predominant practical bent prevents him from using such hard expressions, amounting to a denial of all freedom, as are to be found in Wicklif—must nevertheless define the church, so far as it corresponds to its true idea as the community of the elect; and, though with Augustin, he gives prominence to the notion of a living faith, yet he also, with Augustin and the entire western church, apprehended the notion of justification after a wholly subjective manner; and hence by him, too, it was argued, that no man could, without a special revelation, have any certainty on the point, whether or not he belonged to the number of the predestinated or the elect. Thus in adverting to Christ's words: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, I am in the midst of them," he says: *There*, then, would be a *true particular* church; and, accordingly, where three or four are assembled, up to the whole

number of the elect; and, in this sense, the term church was often used in the New Testament. "And thus"—says he—"all the righteous who now, in the archbishopric of Prague, live under the reign of Christ, and in particular the elect, are the true church of Prague." But, *the one Catholic Church* is the *universitas praedestinatorum, i.e.*, the praedestinate of all times. He then distinguishes the church in the proper and in the improper sense, *vere et nuncupative.* The former is the community of the elect, in the second sense also, the *congregatio praescitorum.* Then the church is denominated, in a *mixed* sense, the community of the *praesciti* and of the *praedestinati* at once; so that, in this case, one part is the church in the *proper*, the other in the *improper* sense. That would be the visible church, therefore, in which, as we should say, those who partake of the essence of the invisible church, and those who belong merely to the visible, are commingled. But, then, according to his above described doctrine, no one can have any certainty on the point, whether he belongs or not to the number of the elect: and hence neither can any one be certain that he is a member of the true church. "It would"—says he—"be the height of arrogance for any man fearlessly to assert, without a special revelation, that he is a member of that holy church; for none but the praedestinate is a member without spot or wrinkle of that church. Therefore"—says he—"we may well be amazed to see with what effrontery those who are most devoted to the world, who live most worldly and abominable lives, most distant from the walk with Christ, and who are most unfruitful in performing the counsels and commandments of Christ, with what fearless effrontery such persons assert, that they are heads, or eminent members of the church, which is His bride." When he wrote this, Huss may have had in his thoughts Pope John XXIII., of whose vices he had doubtless already heard. Hence, too, he distinguishes those who may at a certain time, by the indications of their life in righteousness, seem to be members of the church, and who yet, as they do not belong to the number of the praedestinate, are not members of the mystical body of Christ.[1]

1 Qui nude secundum praesentem justitiam et taliter sunt praesciti de ecclesia pro tempore quo sunt in gratia. Illa autem ecclesia non est corpus Christi mysticum. See the passages cited thus far in De ecclesia, opp. i. fol. 196—206.

Paletz had offered it as an objection to the party of Huss, that they talked of four parties in the church, the parties of the three popes, and a fourth neutral party. This led Huss to remark: Paletz did not understand, then, that the universal church of the faithful, which is in the whole world where believers are to be found, the church which is engaged in the warfare and scattered, is divided not merely into three parts, but into very many parts, all which went to constitute the entirety of the church. Had not, then, this church its members, and its sons in Spain under Benedict, and in Apulia and on the Rhine under Gregory, and in Bohemia under John XXIII.? God forbid that the Christian faith should be extinguished in the simple faithful, and that the grace of baptism should be annihilated in baptized children on account of the three beasts that are quarrelling with one another for their dignity, their pomp, and their avarice.[1]—"Let him retreat within himself"—says he of Paletz—"and sing that song of the church: The holy church, throughout all the world, doth acknowledge thee." And pray in the song of the mass: "To thee we offer the gifts for thy holy Catholic church which thou wilt preserve and guide, scattered throughout all the world. When he sings and prays thus, and meditates on Christ's gospel with the sayings of Augustin, Jerome, and other saints, should he not be surprised rather to learn that the church of Christ is divided into three parts?" He adverts here also to the words of Christ, that where two or three were assembled in his name, he was in the midst of them.—He gives special prominence to the truth that Christ alone is the all-sufficient head of the church; that the church needs no other, and that therein consists its unity. After having cited Ephesians i. 21, to show that Christ is the sole head, he argues that if a Christian in connection with Christ were the head of the universal church, we should have to

1 Non cognoscit iste fictor, quod universalis ecclesia Christi fidelium, militans per totum orbem, ubi sunt Christi fideles, est diffusa, quae non solum tripartitur, imo multipliciter, ultra dividitur in partes ipsam universalem ecclesiam integrantes. Numquid non habet sua membra et suos filios in Hispania sub Benedicto, et in Apulia et in Rheno sub Gregorio, et in Bohemia sub Joanne XXIII.? Absit, quod sit exstincta Christi fides in simplicibus Christi fidelibus et in baptisatis parvulis sit exstincta papalis (doubtless we should read baptismalis) gratia propter tres bestias, pro dignitate et fastu et avaritia contendentes. Resp. ad scr. Paletz, opp. i. fol 260, 2.

concede, that such a Christian was Christ himself, or that Christ was subordinate to him, and only a member of the church. Therefore the apostles had never thought of being aught else than servants of that head, and humble ministers of the church his bride; but no one of them had ever thought of excepting himself and asserting that he was head or bridegroom of the church. "Christ"—says he—"is the all-sufficient head of the church; as he proved, during 300 years of the existence of the church and still longer, in which time the church was most prosperous and happy." And the law of Christ was the most effectual to decide and determine ecclesiastical affairs, since God himself had given it for this purpose. "For Christ never allows the case to occur in which the church can fail to be governed by his law, since pious priests bring that law before the people to be applied according to the rules of holy teachers,—rules which they have made known under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, as is evident from the examples of an Augustin, a Gregory, an Ambrosius, who, after the apostles, were given to the church to be her teachers." Hence it was manifest, that an Augustin had benefited the church more than many popes had done; and in instruction had done more perhaps than all the cardinals from their first creation down to the present.[1] Following out certain maxims of Augustin,[2] he declares that Christ himself was the rock which Peter professed, and on which Christ founded the church, who would therefore come forth triumphant out of all her conflicts.[3] He says, the pope and the cardinals might be the most eminent portion of the church in respect of dignity, yet only in case they followed more carefully the pattern of Christ, and laying aside pomp and the ambition of the primacy, served in a more active and humble manner, their mother the church. But proceeding in the opposite way, they became the abomination of desolation, a college opposed to the humble college of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.[4] Why should not Christ, who, in the holy supper, grants to believers the privilege of par-

1 De ecclesia, opp. i., fol. 202, 2, and fol. 224, 2.
2 Which we have cited in Church History, vol. ii., p. 168.
3 De ecclesia, opp. i., fol. 210, 1.
4 Ibid. fol. 207, 2.

ticipating in a sacramental and spiritual manner of himself; why should not he be *more* present to the church, than the pope, who, living at a distance of more than 800 miles from Bohemia, could not by himself act directly on the feelings and the movements of the faithful in Bohemia, as it was incumbent on the head to do! It would be enough then, to say that the pope is a representative of Christ; and it would be well for him, if he were a faithful servant, predestinated to a participation in the glory of his head —Jesus Christ. Huss asserts that the papacy, by which a visible head was given to the church, derived its origin from the Emperor Constantine; for, until the gift of Constantine, the pope was but a colleague of the other bishops.[1] If the Almighty God could not give other true successors of the apostles than the pope and the cardinals, it would follow, that the power of the emperor, a mere man, by whom the pope and the cardinals were instituted, had set limits to the power of God.[2] Speaking of the sovereignty of Rome conferred on the pope by Louis the pious, he says: "The Apostle Peter, if God pleased, might surely have said to Louis, I accept not what thou offerest me; for, when I was bishop of Rome, I forsook all, and desired not to receive the sovereignty of Rome from Nero; neither did I need it, and I see that it is a great injury to my successors; for it is a hindrance to them, this same honour, in the preaching of the Gospel, in wholesome prayer in fulfilling the divine commandments and counsels; and the greater part of them are betrayed by it into pride. Since, then, the Almighty God is able to take away the prerogatives of all those emperors, and to bring back his church once more to the condition in which all the bishops shall be on the same level, as it was before the gift of Constantine, it is evident that he can give others besides the pope and the cardinals to be *true* successors of the apostles, so as to serve the church as the apostles served it."[3] He cannot agree with those who required an unconditional obedience to the popes and prelates, in relation to things indifferent. "Reason"—he says—"must be man's guide not only in regard to that which is good in itself, but likewise to things indifferent. As regards that which is good

1 Ibid. fol. 224, 2. 2 Ibid. fol. 224, 2 et 224.
3 Ibid.

in itself, should a prelate bid his subject give alms while he left his sons to famish, or impose a fast on him which he could not endure, or bid him make many prayers, for confessors are wont to prescribe such oppressive things—certainly in such matters not even the *pope* is to be obeyed; since a father is more bound to support his sons than to give alms to others; and he is not bound to take upon himself an intolerable burden. And the same holds good also of things indifferent. For, should a pope command me to play on a flute, to build towers, to cut out clothes, or to weave, must not my reason decide for me, that the pope lays on me a senseless command? Wherefore should I not place my own thought before the pope's dictum? Nay, should he with all the doctors lay on me any such command, reason would still decide, that their command was a senseless one. If the pope of his own motion determined to confer a bishopric on one whose vicious life and ignorance in the language of the community whom he had to guide, disqualified him for the duty, even with the command that he should accept of such a charge, would the man be obliged to obey him in this? It is clear that he is by no means obliged to do so. Neither would the people be obliged to accept such a person; for they would not even make one a tender of swine or of goats, who was not qualified to take charge of such animals." And he lays it down as a principle, that the true disciples of Christ must look at the primitive pattern of *Christ himself*, and so far hearken to the prelates, as he prescribed to his flock the law of Christ, that which was conformable to reason and tended to edification. In relation to things indifferent he remarks: to what a condition of slavish servility would Christians be degraded by such a principle; to what abuse, intolerable to Christian men, would such a principle be liable. The pope in such case might order that no Christian should do anything in the whole range of things indifferent, which he might not approve; and so he might commission his satraps to cite any man whom they pleased and make him responsible to their tribunal; and thus might they torment the people after their own good pleasure, and practise extortions upon them, as they have done by their absolutions, reservations, and dispensations. And it may be believed they would do it more, did they not fear that the people, seeing through their trick, would

rise up in rebellion against them. "*For*"—says he—"*already God gives light to the people, that they may not be led astray from the ways of Christ.*"[1] The pain which Huss felt in contemplating the worldliness of the church, his earnest longing for its purification, express themselves in these words of a prayer to Christ: "Almighty Lord, thou who art the way, the truth, and the life, thou knowest how few, in these times, walk in thee, how few follow after thee, as the head, in humility, poverty, chastity, labour, and patience! Broad and open lies the way of Satan, and many walk therein. Help thy little flock, that they may never forsake thee, but follow on through the narrow path, even unto thyself."[2] To this worldly spirit Huss, too, with others, attributes the long, wearisome schism of the church in those days. "As to the question"—says he—"whence this devilish schism has arisen, the very blind may know, that it sprung out of the worldly dowry of the church."[3] Conceiving the unity of the church in the more free and spiritual manner we have described, Huss was prepared also to understand more clearly the multifarious ways of appropriating Christianity, determined by the various peculiarities of individual character, and it is a fine remark which he makes on this subject when he says: "Some love Christ more in reference to his divinity, as we suppose to be the case with the evangelist John; others, more in reference to his humanity, as is thought to be true of Philip; others, more in reference to his body which is the church, and so in many other relations."[4] Here, then, we find characterized three τρόποι παιδείας three different bents of Christian experience;—the predominant tendency to the godlike in Christ, the predominant bent to the human, and to his revelation in the church. Huss, in a conference with Paletz, had required a proof from Holy Scripture in support of something the latter had asserted. Paletz and his associates seized upon this to bring home against him the

1 Jam enim deus populum illuminat, ne seducatur a viis Christi. Ibid. fol. 245, 2.

2 Omnipotens domine qui es via veritas et vita tu nosti, quam pauci in te ambulant istis temporibus, pauci te caput suum in humilitate, paupertate, castitate, laboriositate et patientia imitantur. Aperta est via Satanae, multi vadunt per eam, adjuva pusillum gregem tuum, ut non te deserat, sed per viam angustiae finaliter te sequater. Ibid. fol. 206.

3 Ibid. fol. 230, 2.

4 Ibid. fol. 212, 2.

charge, that he recognized merely the Holy Scriptures, but not God, nor the apostles, nor holy teachers, nor the universal church, as judge in the final appeal. To this accusation Huss replies: "One thing Paletz must assuredly know, that in the matter of faith we agree neither with him, nor with any of his adherents, except so far as they can sustain themselves on the foundation of Sacred Scripture or on reason."[1] Huss, who showed his Christian freedom in this, that he felt bound to follow the Divine Word and reason independent of all other authority, and in opposition to all other, and who, for this reason, was accused of pride by those who stood up for a servile obedience to church authority, was, however, very far from being inclined to persist obstinately in holding an opinion which he had once expressed. He says: "Often have I allowed myself to be set right even by one of my own scholars, when I saw that the reasons were good, and I felt bound to thank him for the correction."[2]

In this work we find laid down the four principles of reform which constitute the soul of the whole movement that proceeded from Huss; the germ and beginning of the four articles subsequently held fast by the more moderate portion of the Hussite party. To wit: in opposition to the charge that the people were led astray by his party, he says—1. It was their endeavour rather to make the Christian people *one;* to bring them into a harmonious unity by the law of Christ; 2. That antichristian ordinances should not delude the people, which could not divide them from Christ; but that the law of Christ in its purity should rule, together with the customs of the people which harmonized with the law of the Lord; 3. That the clergy should live pure, according to the law of Christ; should banish pomp, cupidity, and luxury; 4. That the militant church should consist of the orders instituted by our Lord, namely, the priests of Christ, who faithfully fulfilled his law, the secular nobles, who should compel the rest to observe Christian ordinances, and the lower class of people, who should serve both orders according to the law of Christ.[3]

[1] Ibid. fol. 227, 1.

[2] Sicut mihi frequentius acciderat, dum mandavi et doctus de meliori etiam gratanter informationem suscipiens discipulo obedivi. Ibid. fol. 247, 1.

[3] Ibid. fol. 231, 1.

We would join, with what we have taken from the book of Huss on the church, what he said akin to this in the tract already mentioned as having been composed about this time and directed against Stanislaus of Znaim. Had he affirmed that a bad pope, who was a reprobate, could not be head of the church, his adversaries, who were glad of a chance to carry spiritual matters over into politics, hoping thus to make the doctrines of Huss appear the more dangerous to secular authority, would have argued from it that the king of Bohemia then, if he were a *praescitus*, could not be king. And so Huss would have been held up to view as the representative of a radical and revolutionary party. But Huss uniformly declared himself opposed to this method of carrying the subject over into a wholly different province. Christ, he said, was the head in *spiritual* things, and governed the church in a far more necessary way than the emperor who was head in *temporal* things. For Christ, who is seated at the right hand of the Father, must necessarily govern the militant church as its head.[1] Against the necessity of a visible head, Huss cited the papal female reign of the tenth century, the time of the vacancy in the papal chair.[2] Christ can better govern his church, says he, by his true disciples scattered through all the world, without such monsters of supreme heads.[3] The theological faculty had called the pope the secure never-failing and all-sufficient refuge for his church. Against this Huss says: No created being can hold this place. This language can be applied only to Christ. He alone is the secure, unfailing, and all-sufficient refuge for his church, to guide and enlighten it. And he appeals to the words of Christ, Without me ye can do nothing (John xv. 5).[4] What sound views he entertained of the progressive advance of the church as a necessarily free progression, is evidenced by these words: "It injures not the church, but benefits it, that Christ is no longer present to it after a visible manner: since he himself says to his disciples and therefore to all their successors (John xvi. 7), It is good for you that I go away, for if I went not away, the Comforter would not come to you; but if I go, I will send him unto you." It is evident from this, as the truth itself testi-

1 Resp. ad scr. Stanislai, opp. i. fol. 277, 1.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid. fol. 277, 2.
4 Ibid.

fies, that it was a salutary thing for the church militant that Christ should ascend from it to heaven, that so his longer protracted bodily and visible presence on earth might not be prejudicial to her.[1] Accordingly he concludes that the church is sufficiently provided for in the invisible guidance, and should need no visible one by which she might be made dependant. Suppose then that the pope who walks visibly among men, were as good a teacher as that promised Spirit of truth, for which one need not to run to Rome or Jerusalem, since he is everywhere present, in that he fills the world. Suppose also that the pope were as secure, unfailing, and all-sufficient a refuge for all the sons of the church as that Holy Spirit, it would follow that you supposed a fourth person in the Divine Trinity.[2] Huss sees clearly how the mistaken endeavour to secure unity to the church by externalization, by making it dependant on a visible head, instead of operating, as was intended, to prevent heresies and divisions, provoked the contrary and multiplied them. "For"—says he—"it is evident that the greatest errors and the greatest divisions have arisen by occasion of this head of the church, and that they have gone on multiplying to this day. For before such a head had been instituted by the emperor, the church was constantly adding to her virtues; but after the appointment of such a head, the evils have continually mounted higher; and there will be no end to all this, until this head, with its body, be brought back to the rule of the apostles." It was not Saracens, Greeks, and Jews alone that took umbrage at this; but since the schism between the popes, there had sprung up such divisions among the people, that few were to be found who agreed together in their walk according to the law of Christ. All *true* unity must have its foundation in Christ.[3] When the opponents of Huss, following the fashion of their age, resorted to a very arbitrary system of so-called philosophy and false analogies drawn from the organism of the body,

1 Ibid. fol. 269, 1.

2 Ponat ergo doctor papam conversantem in humanis ita bonum doctorem, sicut bonus doctor est iste promissus spiritus veritatis, ad quem non est necesse Hierusalem vel Romam currere, cum sit ubique praesens, replens orbem terrarum. Ponat etiam doctor papam ita securum, certum et indeficiens, sed omnino sufficiens, refugium omnibus filiis ecclesiae, sicut est iste spiritus sanctus, et dicam, quod posuit quartam personem in divinis. Ibid. fol. 283, 1.

3 Omnem vero concordiam veram et sanctam in militante ecclesia oportet esse in Christo domino stabilitam. Ibid. fol. 279, 1.

to demonstrate the necessity of such an organism as that of the existing hierarchy, confounding together, as was so common in those times, philosophy and theology in a way equally injurious to both, Huss might justly accuse them of unwarrantably mixing up worldly wisdom with revealed truth, and substituting the water of a cistern for that of the living spring.[1] Of the only necessary and truly uninterrupted agency, in the church, of the Holy Spirit, Huss says: "This Spirit, in the absence of a visible pope, inspired prophets to predict the future bridegroom of the church, strengthened the apostles to spread the gospel of Christ through all the world, led idolators to the worship of one only God, and ceases not, even until now, to instruct the bride and all her sons, to make them certain of all things and guide them in all things that are necessary for salvation."[2] To show that the church may be governed best by organs ordained and guided by Christ, he says: "As the apostles and the priests of Christ ably conducted the affairs of the church in all things necessary to salvation, before the office of pope had yet been introduced, so they will do it again if it should happen, as it is quite possible it may, that no pope should exist, until the day of judgment; for Christ is able to govern his church, after the best manner, by his faithful presbyters, without a pope."[3] So in pointing out the contrast between pious priests and the cardinals, he says: "The cardinals, occupied with worldly business, cannot teach and guide, by sermons, in the articles of faith and the precepts of the Lord, the members of the universal church and of our Lord Jesus Christ. But the poor and lowly priests of Christ, who have put away out of their hearts all ambition, and all ungodli-

1 Quis non conciperet ratione discutiens, quod hoc est cisternam extraneam, praeter aquam Christi fodere, philosophiam fallaciter cum scriptura sacra commiscere? Ibid. fol 279, 2.

2 Ille ergo spiritus, nullo papa conversante in humanis visibiliter, prophetas aspiravit, ut sponsum futurum ecclesiae praecinerent, apostolos confortavit, ut Christi evangelium per mundum veherent, idolatras ad cultum revocavit, et nunc non deficit ipsam sponsam et omnes ejus filios informare, certificare ac dirigere in necessariis ad salutem. Ibid. fol. 283, 1.

3 Sicut apostoli et fideles sacerdotes domini strenue in necessariis ad salutem regularunt ecclesiam, antequam papae officium fuerat introductum, sic facerent, deficiente per summe possibile papa, usque ad diem judicii; cum ipse Christus potest suam ecclesiam optime per suos fideles presbyteros regere sine papa. Ibid. fol. 283, 2.

ness of the world, being themselves guided by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, teach and guide the sons of the church, quickened by the grace of the Holy Spirit, and give them certainty in the articles of faith and the precepts necessary to salvation."[1] He shows how the church has all that it needs in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and ought to require nothing else; nothing else can be a substitute for that. Stanislaus of Znaim had affirmed that the church could not have been left by Christ without a visible head, for it would be leaving her in a condition of too great embarrassment. Huss replies: "Far be it from our hearts ever to utter a sentiment so heretical as this. For it directly contradicts the declarations of the gospels. How can the church be embarrassed, when she has the bridegroom with her to the end of the world; when she has a sure consolation and an infallible promise, the promise of Christ's own word, that if we ask the Father anything in *his* name, he will give it us? And, Whatever ye ask of the Bridegroom, he will do. From no pope can she obtain this."[2] Huss says of himself: "Relying on Christ, that Witness whom no multitude of witnesses can draw away from the truth, whom the Roman court cannot terrify, whom no gift can corrupt and no power overcome, I will confess the gospel truth, so long as he himself gives me grace to do so."[3] In the time of those earlier proceedings for the restoration of concord, Huss expressed, in letters addressed to his friends in Prague, his high assurance of faith, his firm resolution never to give up a particle of the truth, never to purchase peace and quiet by any denial of the truth. We find him already with a mind fully made up to die rather than to swerve from strict integrity and an honest avowal of his convictions. So he writes to a friend, Master Christann of Prachatic, rector of Prague University: "As to the advice of the faculty, with Christ's help I would not receive it, if I stood before a stake, which was ready prepared for my execution; and I hope that death will sooner remove me or the two who have deserted the truth (Stephen Paletz and Stanislaus of Znaim), either to heaven or to hell, than

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid.

[3] Unde de isto testo confidens, quem nulla multitudo testium potest a veritate flectere, nec Romana curia exterrere, nec aliquod munus curvare, nec aliqua potentia vincere, veritatem evangelicam, quamdiu ipse donaverit, confitebor. Ibid. fol. 287, 2.

I shall be induced to adopt their opinions. For I knew them both as men who, in earlier times, truly confessed the truth as it is in Christ; but, overcome by fear, they have turned to flattering the pope, and to lies." "If"—he writes—"I cannot make the truth free in all, I will at least not be an enemy to the truth, and will resist to the death all agreement with falsehood. Let the world flow on as the Lord permits it to flow! A good death is better than a bad life. One ought never to sin through fear of death. To end this life, by God's grace, is to pass out of misery. The more knowledge of truth one gains, the harder he has to work. He who speaks the truth, breaks his own neck. He who fears death, loses the joy of living. Truth triumphs over all; he triumphs who dies for the truth; for no calamity can touch him, if no sin has dominion over him! Blessed are ye when men curse you, says the Truth. This is the foundation on which I build; this is the food for my spirit, recruiting it with fresh vigour to contend against all adversaries of the truth." Alluding to the deliberations then in progress about the course which ought to be pursued in order to clear the kingdom from the reproach of heresy, Huss in a letter to the same person remarks: "As to the disgrace of the king and the realm, of what harm is it, if the king is good, and some at least of the inhabitants of the realm are good? Christ passed through the greatest reproach together with his chosen, to whom he said (John xvi. 2; Matt. x. 21, 22), Ye shall be delivered up by your parents and kinsmen; which is more than to be reproached by Stanislaus or Paletz."[1]

With this rector of Prague University, Huss kept up a correspondence from Kozi. The same person had written him a letter of consolation, placing before him several passages of Scripture which speak of the sufferings of the righteous, such as 2 Tim. iii. 12, and reasoning from them that he should not allow himself to be troubled by his temporal afflictions and separation from his friends, but rejoice over all. "Very thankfully," answers Huss, "do I accept this consolation, while I fasten on those passages of Scripture and rely on this, that if I am a righteous man, nothing can trouble me or induce me to swerve from the truth. And if

[1] Extracts from these as yet unpublished letters in Palacky iii. 1, p. 297 and 298, note.

I live and will live devoutly in Christ, then in the name of Christ must I suffer persecutions; for if it became Christ to suffer and so enter into his glory, it surely becomes us, poor creatures, to take up the cross and so follow him in his sufferings. And I assure you that persecution would never trouble me, if my sins and the corruption of Christian people did not trouble me. For what harm could it do me to lose the riches of this world, which are but dross? What harm, to lose the favour of the world, which might lead me astray from the way of Christ? What harm, to suffer reproach, which, if borne with patience, purifies and transfigures the children of God, so that they shine like the sun, in the kingdom of their Father? And finally, what harm, to have my poor life taken from me, which is death; if he who loses this, lays death aside, and finds the true life? But this is what they cannot comprehend, who are blinded by pomp, honour, and avarice, and by whom some have been seduced from the truth through fear, where nothing was to be feared." "As to my body"—says he—"that I hope, by the Lord Jesus Christ, if mercy bestow the strength on me, to offer up, since I desire not to live longer in this miserable world, if I cannot stir up myself and others, according to the will of God, to repentance. This I wish for you also; and I exhort you, in the Lord Jesus Christ, with all the companions of your board, that you be ready for the trial; for the prelude of antichrist must begin first, and then the contest will go on in right good earnest. And the goose must flap her wings against the wings of behemoth, and against the tail which always conceals the abominations of antichrist. The Lord will reduce the tail and his prophets to nothing, *i.e.*, the pope and his prophets, the masters, teachers, and jurists, who, under the hypocritical name of holiness, conceal the abominations of the beast." He then adverts to it, that the papacy is the abomination of self-deification in the holy place, as the papacy made traffic of spiritual things. "Wo then is me"—he writes—"if I do not preach of that abomination, if I do not weep over it, write about it."[1] It was a great grief to Huss to be obliged to leave the scene of the conflict, and suspend his labours for his beloved community in Bethlehem chapel. He had a severe struggle

[1] Hus opp. i. fol. 94, 1 et 2.

with himself, his most earnest wishes calling him back to his flock, while on the other hand imperative reasons bade him to remain concealed a while, that the best interests of this community might be promoted. He considered it of prime importance here to make the words and the example of Christ his rule of action. To this a great deal relates, in the letters which he wrote to his community or to his fellow-combatants among the clergy, whose opinion he consults on this subject.[1] In a letter to two clergymen, he writes: "Having an earnest desire to preach the gospel, I am troubled, since I know not what I ought to do. I have, indeed, pondered in my soul those words of our Lord (John x. 11, 12), A good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep and fleeth, and the wolf catcheth them and scattereth the sheep." And then he says: "But I have thought also of the words of our Lord (Matt. x. 23), But when they persecute you in one city, flee ye into another. Behold the precept or promise of Christ: I know not which of these two opposite things I ought to do." He then cites a letter of Augustin, written during the persecutions of the Vandals, and addressed to Honoratus, a clergyman, who had asked his advice as to the course of duty. "Give me, then, your opinion. Could you rest satisfied with the advice of Augustin? For my conscience troubles me. I know not but my absence may give scandal, though the sheep do not want for needful nourishment from the divine word. On the other hand, I encounter the fear lest my presence should, through that execrable device of an interdict, be laid hold of as a pretext for depriving them of their nourishment, namely the communion, and other things ministrant to salvation. Therefore let us humbly beg that the Almighty God would teach us what I, a poor creature, ought to do in this present case, so as not to swerve from the 'path of uprightness." Accordingly he writes, just before the Christmas festival of 1413, to his Bethlehem congregation: "Dearly beloved—the day of our Lord's nativity draws near; therefore make clean the inner house, that it be pure from all sin. So far as you are able, hear diligently and devoutly the word of

[1] Ep. ad Mag. Martinum et Mag. Nicol. de Miliczin, opp. i. fol. 93, 2 and fol. 94, 1.

God. Care not for those enemies who would keep you from hearing the sermons in Bethlehem chapel. Once I myself was the reason why they endeavoured to draw you away from that house. Now they have no such reason. But if they say, I have run away and left you; be assured that I did it voluntarily, to fulfil the word of Christ and in imitation of his example, who says, Whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet" (Matt. x. 14 and x. 23), and he adverts to the fact that Christ often, when the Jews would have killed him, escaped from their hands (John x. 39, xi. 54 ff.). "It is no wonder, therefore" —he proceeds—"that, in imitation of his example, I have withdrawn myself, for the present; and that the priests seek for me, and ask where I am. Know then that I, led by this exhortation of Christ and by his example, have withdrawn myself, that I may not prove to the wicked an occasion of everlasting damnation; and to the good, cause of oppression and trouble: and then again, that the godless priests may not wholly prevent the preaching of the divine word. I have not yielded, therefore, with any intention that divine truth should be denied, through me, for which truth I hope, with God's help, to die. In the next place, you know that it became Christ, as he himself says, to suffer until the time appointed by the Father. Of this, then, be well assured, that whatever God has determined to do with me, will be done. And if I am worthy to die for his name, he will call to me suffering. But if it be his pleasure to draw me forth, once more, to the preaching of his word, this depends upon his own will." He then observes that "it was no doubt the wish of many priests in Prague that he should return thither; for the interdict would then supply them with an excuse for their indolence: no masses would have to be read, no hours to be sung; but all such were enemies to the preaching of the gospel, because their vices were exposed thereby to the light. Nevertheless you, he adds, who love God's word and strive to become one with it, would be glad to see me because you love me as your neighbour. I too would be glad once more to see you, that I might preach to you God's word: for this must ever be the great and especial concern of the ministers of the church, to preach to the people the Gospel of Christ in its purity and with fruit, so that the

people may know God's will, avoid the bad and be led in the good way of a just and virtuous life. Wo therefore to the priests who neglect God's word, who lead lives of indolent repose when they might be preaching it. And wo to those who hinder the preaching and the hearing of the divine word. But blessed are they who hear it and treasure it up in their hearts, and by good works observe it."[1] On the festival of Christmas, he wrote to that community: "Though I am at present separated from you in the body, because perhaps I am not worthy to preach to you any longer the word of God; yet the love with which I infold you, impels me to come, in the way at least of addressing you a few words." The few words were to this effect: that what, in other circumstances, he would have said to them from the pulpit, was briefly summed up in this letter; that they should lay to heart the significance of the festival; that he wished them the heavenly blessings secured to the faithful by the event which this festival commemorated.[2] In another letter to the same community, he applies to himself the words of Paul in the epistle to the Philippians (i. 23): "I say to you, my beloved, though I am not in prison, yet I would gladly, for Christ's sake, die and be with him; and yet I would gladly too, for your good, preach to you God's word; but I am in a strait betwixt two, and know not which to choose. For I await God's mercy, and I fear again lest something bad be done among you, so as to expose the faithful to persecution and the unbelieving to eternal death." He says of his enemies: "They at present rejoice, and wish that not only in me the word of God may perish, but also that Bethlehem church, where I preached to you the gospel of Christ, may be closed. But without God's permission they will accomplish nothing; if, however, he permits it, it will be done on account of the sins of unthankful men; as Bethlehem where he was born, and Jerusalem where he redeemed us, were utterly destroyed."[3] Although a presentiment of the death which might befal him in contending for the truth had long been on his mind, yet he had at the same time a prophetic consciousness that, though his person might perish, the truth would come forth triumphant out

1 Ibid. fol. 98, 2 and fol. 99, 1.
2 Ibid. fol. 99, 1 and 2.
3 Ibid. fol. 97, 1.

of the contest, and would by other instrumentalities be still more powerfully attested. We may look upon such utterances of Huss, which we shall occasionally come across, as a prophecy of the German Reformation, though Huss was really thinking of that which was presently to take place on the theatre of his own past labours. Thus he writes a letter to the Bethlehem community, at the time when various attempts were made to break it up: "They have directed their attacks against many churches and chapels, that the word of God might not be preached in them. Yet Christ has not permitted them to accomplish their purpose. Already, as I hear, they are seeking the destruction of Bethlehem chapel, and in other chapels they forbid the preaching of God's word. Yet I trust in God that they will accomplish nothing. At first they prepared snares, citations, and ban for the 'goose,' and already they are lying in wait for some of you. *But since the goose, a tame animal, a domestic animal, with no wings to soar aloft, has broken through their snares, we may the more confidently expect that other birds who, by the word of God and their lives do soar aloft, will turn their toils and plottings to nought.*" And after having remarked how, by the interdict, they were seeking to suppress the worship and word of God in Prague, he adds: "*But the more they seek to conceal their own real character, the more openly it betrays itself; and the more they seek to spread out their decrees like a net, the more they are rent in pieces;* and in seeking to have the peace of the world, they lose that and spiritual peace at the same time; in seeking to injure others, they injure themselves most. It happened to them as to the priests of the Jews; they lost that which they were endeavouring to secure, and fell into the evil they were aiming to avoid, in fancying that they could overcome and suppress the truth, which always conquers; *since this is its habit and nature, that the more it is obscured the more it shines out, and the more it is beat down the higher it rises. Priests, scribes, and pharisees, Herod, Pilate, and the other dwellers in Jerusalem, condemned truth, and gave it over to death and the grave; but it arose again, all-conquering, and substituted in place of itself twelve other heralds.* And this same Truth has sent to Prague instead of one feeble goose, many falcons and eagles, which excel in sharpness of vision all other birds.

These, by the grace of God, soar upward, high upward, and swoop away other birds to Jesus Christ, who will strengthen them, and confirm all his faithful ones. For he declares I am with you always, unto the end of the world. If *He* then be with us, the true God and mightiest, best defender, who, in his malice, shall be against us? What fear or what death shall separate us from Him? What do we lose when, *for his sake*, we lose earthly goods, friends, honours, and this wretched life? Surely we shall then first be delivered from this wretchedness and obtain a hundred-fold greater possessions, dearer friends, and a more perfect joy. Death shall not deprive us of these things. For he who dies for Christ conquers, and will be delivered from all sorrows and attain to that eternal joy to which may our Saviour Jesus Christ bring us all. This letter"—he concludes—"dearest brethren and beloved sisters, I have written, to the end that you might stand fast in the truth you have known, fear no citations and attend not a whit less than you ever did, on account of their cruel threats, to the preaching of God's word. For God is faithful, who will establish you and preserve you from evil." Then follows a postscript of requests, hinting at the labours to which Huss was then devoting himself in his retirement. "Pray for those who preach God's truth with grace, and pray also for me, that I may more richly write and preach against antichrist, and that God may lead me in the battle, when I am driven to the greatest strait, that so I may be able to maintain *his own* truth. For know, that I shrink not from giving up this poor body for God's truth, when I feel assured there is no want of the preaching of God's word, but that daily the truth of the gospel is more widely spread. But I desire to live for their sakes to whom violence is done, and who need the preaching of God's word, that in this way the malice of antichrist may be discovered as a warning to the pious. I preach therefore in other places, ministering to whoever may be found there; since I know that God's will is fulfilled in me, whether it be by a death hung over me by antichrist, or whether I die in sickness. And if I come to Prague, I am certain that my enemies will lie in wait for me and persecute you, they who do not serve God *themselves* and hinder others from serving him. But let us pray God for them, if peradven-

ture there may be some elect ones among them, that they may be turned to the knowledge of the truth."[1] Respecting the attempts to shut up or destroy Bethlehem chapel, he says: "They would suppress God's holy word, tear down a chapel erected for its service, and hinder the people in their salvation." He calls upon them to ponder well the disgrace which would be brought upon their country, their nation, their race; the calumny and shame which would fall upon themselves without any fault of their own. Antichrist and the devil could do them no harm, if they remained faithful to divine truth. They had now, for some years, been lying in wait for himself, and had not (as he hoped in God) hurt a hair of his head, but only occasioned him greater cheerfulness and hilarity. Great pains would be taken to induce them to abjure the errors imputed to them. Huss warns them that, by so doing, they would either deny the truth, or wrongly accuse themselves of errors which they were far from cherishing. He exhorts them to trust in Christ the Almighty.[2] He reminds the Bethlehem congregation of his many years of labour among them and of its fruits, and says: "For the sake of this, as God is my witness, I have laboured more than twelve years in preaching among you the divine word: and in this my greatest consolation was to observe your earnest diligence in hearing God's word and to witness the true and sincere repentance of many." He warns them against the fickleness of those who once fought by him and then went over to the other side. "Have no regard for those persons walking a crooked path, who have turned about and are now the most violent enemies of *God*, and *our* enemies." He reminds them that, even among the disciples of Christ, were those who once walked with him and then fell away from him. Exhorting them not to follow such examples, but faithfully to persevere in the confession of the truth and in attachment to those whom the Lord had sent to preach it to them, he requests them to pray for himself, that God would give him good success in preaching his word. "In all the places"—says he—"where a need exists, in cities, in villages, in castles, in the fields, in forests, wherever I can be of any use, pray for

1 Ibid. fol. 96, 2 and fol. 97, 1.

2 See Ferd. B. Milowec, Letters of John Huss, written at Constance 1414—1415, published in the original Bohemian Leips. 1849. Let. 4.

me, that the word of God may not be kept back in me."[1] Sympathy with the cause of Huss, we perceive, had spread into other cities of Bohemia. Thus we find a letter of his to a foreign community, exhorting them to concord and warning them against internal dissensions.[2] To a parish priest in Prachatic, one who had been concerned in passing the sentence of condemnation against the forty-five propositions of Wicklif and in burning his writings, and who persisted in clamouring against Huss himself as a heretic, he wrote a letter challenging the man to convict him of a single heresy, but upbraiding him with the fact that, with all his pretended zeal for orthodoxy, he had constantly neglected the duties of the pastoral office, for which he had been thirty years responsible. "You might yourself call to mind how, for about thirty years, you have sheared the sheep in Prachatic. And where is your residence, your work; where the pasturage of your sheep?" He reminds him of what Christ, to whom he must render an account of his doings, says against unfaithful shepherds (John x.), and adds: "This you should have thought of before you denounced your neighbour as a heretic."[3]

From expressions which dropped from him in several of these letters, it is evident that his separation from his beloved flock bore heavily upon his spirits. There may be some ground, therefore, for the report that Huss in the course of this year, 1413, went privately several times to Prague, and resided there; leaving the city, as soon as his presence became known, and began to make a stir."[4] Some time afterwards, to be nearer to his church, he changed his residence and accepted the invitation of a friend, belongly to the knightly order, Henry of Lazan, who offered him, as a place of refuge, his castle, the strong-hold of Cracowec. From this spot, too, he laboured for the spread of evangelical truth, visiting those places where large multitudes were wont to gather, and preaching before them. From all quarters, it is said, the people flocked together in crowds to hear him.

Meanwhile the time drew near for the assembling of the

1 Opp. i. fol. 99, 2, and 100, 1.
2 Ibid. fol. 100, 2.
3 Ibid. fol. 93, 2.
4 Palacky iii. 1, p. 304.

general council at Constance. To the objects of this council, the reformation of the church in its head and members, the restoration of concord, tranquillity, and peace in the church, necessarily belonged the adjustment of the controversies in Bohemia and Moravia, which threatened to spread wider every day, and which had already attracted universal attention. Chancellor Gerson had at an earlier period already apprized Archbishop Conrad, of Vechta, of the danger which threatened the church of a revolution growing out of the commotions in Bohemia, and exhorted him to apply strenuous measures for the suppression of heresies. Nor could it fail to happen that the Emperor Sigismund would be urged to bring this matter also within the circle of business to be transacted at the council. He invited his brother, King Wenceslaus, to send Huss to Constance, and promised to furnish the latter with a safe conduct. He caused Huss to be informed by Lefl, of Lazan, one of the two knights employed to negotiate this affair between him and the emperor, that he would make sufficient provision for his being heard before the council, and that if he did not submit to the decision of the council, he would send him back unharmed to Bohemia.[1] Huss needed no such invitation either from the emperor or the king. An opportunity to defend himself from the charge of heresy, to give an account of his faith in presence of the representatives of all Western Christendom, and to testify against the corruptions of the church, was what he most earnestly desired. But, before he set out on his journey to Constance, he appeared once more, in the August of 1414, in Prague. Here, by a public notice posted on all the church doors, he invited any man who pleased, under the condi-

[1] Ep. 34, opp. i. fol. 69, 1. The instrument relating to this matter drawn up by the emperor, whereby Huss is taken under the protection of the emperor and the empire, speaks expressly not only of the journey of Huss to Constance, but also of his return home: Ut ei transire, stare, morari, *redire* libere permittatis. Opp. i. fol. 1, 2. We notice this on account of the sophistical interpretations of that document in modern times, as though it were merely a passport given to Huss for his journey to Constance, and as though the emperor, therefore, had not bound himself by his word to secure safety to Huss in Constance itself. To be sure, there is no express mention of this, nor ought there to be any if we consider the nature of the document which is addressed not to the council but to the lords and magistrates in the districts through which Huss would be obliged to travel: but as Huss was taken unconditionally under the protection of the emperor and the empire, as it speaks not barely of his journey to Constance but also of his return home, it is implied that he should have it in his power to return home unharmed from Constance.

tion that if he could not make good his case he would agree to suffer the same punishment which Huss would be liable to if convicted, to convict him before the archbishop, or a synod to be convoked by him, of any heresy. Huss could not get permission, it is true, either for *himself* or for his advocate Jesenic, to appear before the synod. He was put aside with the declaration, that they were too busily occupied with other affairs of the kingdom, to be able to attend to his matter. He got a certificate drawn up to that effect. He had an interview, moreover, with the archbishop,[1] after which the latter made out for him a declaration, stating that he found him guilty of no heresy; that he had nothing to lay against him, save this only that he had remained so long under the ban, and nothing to advise, save only that he should get it removed as soon as possible.[2] He also submitted to a special examination of the charges brought against him, and undertook to demonstrate their futility.[3] He procured an investigation of his creed under the direction of the pope's inquisitor, the bishop of Nazareth, and he too drew up a testimonial, certifying that he found nothing heretical in him. But, though many false accusations had been brought against Huss, and his expressions often perverted by his enemies, yet it is evident from the expositions we have already given, that outwardly devoted as Huss at that time really was to the dominant church system, the principles expressed by him did, in fact, contain within them germs of doctrine which would lead to an overthrow of that system. But it depended entirely upon the fact, how far, how sharply and profoundly, the individual who conducted his examination was capable of seeing, whether or not that individual would be able to detect in the obedience, which appeared so obvious as a matter of fact, the germ of resistance which lay concealed at bottom. And we certainly should not omit to notice, that the advocates of the church party in Prague at that time might be

1 There was probably no *personal* interview. The statement is simply (fol. 3, 2): Supplex petebat a dominis baronibus, ut suo nomine agerent cum domino archiepiscopo. Neither does Palacky know of any such interview.

2 Opp. i. fol. 3, 2.

3 The report of this trial from a copy made by Peter of Mladenowic, secretary to that zealous friend of Huss, the Knight John of Chlum, is printed in the Stud. u. Kritik. 1837, 1, Heft.

determined in some measure, by a regard to the party opposed to them, to act otherwise than they would have done in different circumstances.[1] Huss before his departure wrote to the Emperor Sigismund, thanking him for the trouble he took on his account. He says: "I will humbly trust my life on it, and under the safe-conduct of your protection shall, with the permission of the Highest, appear at the next council at Constance." He begs the emperor to provide for it; that, coming in peace to Constance, he might there have an opportunity publicly to confess his faith. "For, as I have taught nothing in secret, so I wish to be heard, to be examined, to preach, and, under help of the Divine Spirit, to answer all who are disposed to accuse me, not in secret but publicly. And I hope I shall not be afraid to confess the Lord Christ, and, if it must be, to die for his law, which is the most true." The emperor, as we find from this letter, had promised Huss that his cause should be conducted to a happy issue,[2] whence, it is evident, how far the emperor was from wishing or anticipating any such result as that which actually came about. Huss thanked the emperor for his kind intentions, and in allusion to his promise, said "Which, too, your Majesty will perform to the honour of the King of kings." It is evident from many things which he says, in his farewell letter, that Huss set out on his journey to Constance with a feeling of perfect confidence in the emperor's word, and the promised letter of safe-conduct, though that paper had not yet been put into his hands. Several of his friends cautioned him against trusting too much in the emperor's word—he could deliver him over to his enemies.[3] Afterwards, in the midst of his trials at Constance, the words of one of his congregation, Andrew, a Polish tailor, recurred to his thoughts, who, in taking leave, said to

1 As Palctz expresses himself: No one ventured to call the followers of Huss by their proper name, quia rerum et corporum periculum immineret. Opp. i fol. 255, 2.

2 Volens ad finem laudabilem deducere. See this letter in Palacky iii. 1, p. 312 and 313 note.

3 Huss himself called to mind, when his death was near at hand, what his friends in Bohemia had said to him on this subject: Quod cavere deberem a suo conducto, et: Ipse te dabit inimicis, and the words addressed to him by a certain knight: He might be sure that he would be condemned. He supposes this person must have known the purpose of the emperor. Ep. 34, opp. i. fol. 68, 2.

him: "God be with thee; for hardly, think I, wilt thou get back again unharmed, dearest Master John, and most steadfast in the truth! Not the king of Hungary but the King of Heaven reward thee with all good for the good and true instruction that I have received from thee."[1] It was the consciousness of following a divine call, which animated Huss in directing his steps to Constance, though the presentiment of death was not absent from his mind. He was resigned to the will of God, let his cause issue as it might, the glory and triumph of divine truth, the weal of the souls for whom he had laboured, being his sole wish. So he expresses himself in his last letter, taking leave of his congregation, written the day before his departure, October 10th, 1414. "You know"—he begins—"my brethren, that I have now long instructed you in good faith, setting before you *God's* word, not things remote from the faith in Christ, not false doctrines. For I have always sought and will ever seek, so long as I live, your welfare." He then says, that he had intended, before leaving, to preach before them, and defend himself from the false accusations against his faith, but had been prevented by want of time, and reserved it for a future opportunity. He tells them, that he is going into the midst of his worst enemies. "There will be more against me"—he says—"in the council of my enemies, than there were against our Saviour: first, of the number of bishops and masters; next of the princes of this world and pharisees. But I hope in God, my Almighty Saviour, that on the ground of his own promise and in answer to your fervent prayers, he will bestow on me wisdom, and a skilful tongue, so as to be able to stand up against them. He will, too, bestow on me a spirit to despise persecutions, imprisonment, and death; for we see that Christ himself suffered for the sake of his chosen, giving us an example, that we should suffer all things for Him and for our salvation. He certainly cannot perish, who believes on him and perseveres in *his* truth." "If my death"—says he—"can glorify his name, then may he hasten it, and give me grace to endure with good courage whatever evil may befal me. But, if it is better for me that I should return to you, then let us beseech God for this, that I may come back to you from the council without wrong; that is, without detriment to his truth,

[1] Ibid. ep. 33.

so that we may from thenceforth be able to come to a purer knowledge of it, to destroy the doctrines of antichrist, and leave behind us a good example for our brethren." "Perhaps"—says he—"you will never see me again in Prague; but, if God should, in his mercy, bring me back to you again, I will with a more cheerful courage go on in the law of the Lord; but especially when we shall meet together in eternal glory. God is merciful and just, and gives peace to his own here, and beyond death. May He watch over you, who has cleansed us, his sheep, through his own holy and precious blood, which blood is the everlasting pledge of our salvation. And may He grant, that you may be enabled to fulfil his will, and having fulfilled it, attain to peace and eternal glory through our Lord Jesus Christ, with all who abide in his truth."[1] He sent back also a letter to his disciple, Martin, a young man who had been trained up from childhood under his care, superscribed with the injunction that he was not to open it till he received certain intelligence of his death. It contained touching exhortations to purity of morals, warned him against extravagance in dress, a foible which still clung to the young candidate, and enjoined it upon him never to seek a parish for any earthly advantage, but only from a desire to promote the welfare of souls.[2] He cautions him against imitating what was faulty in his own example, mentioning among other things, his passionate fondness, before he entered the priesthood, for the game of chess, in pursuing which amusement he had allowed himself to grow excited even to anger against others. Such was the delicate sensibility of his conscience.[3] He departed from Prague, on the 11th of October, 1414, in company with four others—the two knights, who had it in charge to protect him from all injury, Wenzel of Duba, and John of Chlum, that zealous, noble friend of Huss, whom we shall often have occasion to mention hereafter: Chlum's secretary, the Bachelor Peter of Mladenowic, who also was sincerely attached

1 Opp. i. fol. 57 cp. 2, and Mikowec, 1, Letter.

2 Si vocatus fueris ad plebaniam, honor dei, salus animarum et labor te moveat, non habitio scropharum vel praediorum. Opp. i. fol. 57, 1; ep. 1.

3 Scis, quia (proh dolor) ante sacerdotum meum libenter et saepe schacos lusi, tempus neglexi et saepe alios et me ad iracundiam per illum ludum infeliciter provocavi.

to Huss, and his friend, the delegate from Prague University, Priest John Cardinalis, of Reinstein.

Though it was more particularly with the party of the German theologians that Huss had thus far to contend, yet the reception he met with in his journey through Germany, was by no means such as he might have been led to expect in a country where the report of his heresies had been so industriously circulated by his enemies. A great longing for the reformation of the church had already spread wide among the German people; and this perhaps inclined many to look favourably on a man who had distinguished himself, as they may have heard in various ways, by his zeal against the corruption of the spiritual orders, and for the purification of the church. Their personal intercourse with Huss, the impression conveyed by his looks and his discourse, would tend to strengthen this inclination to regard him with favour. He nowhere avoided notice: in every town he showed himself openly in his carriage, travelling in the dress of a priest.[1] In all the places through which he passed, he posted up public notices in Bohemian, Latin, and German, offering to give any one who wished to speak with him, on the matter of his faith, an account of his religious convictions, and to prove that he was very far from cherishing anything like heresy. In the little town of Pernau, the parish priest with his vicars waited upon him in person at his quarters, drank to his health from a large tankard of wine, conversed with him on matters of Christian faith, avowed that he fully agreed with him, and declared that he had always been his friend.[2] In Nuremburg, the ancient seat of the Friends of God, merchants, who arrived earlier than himself, had already spread the news that he was on his way and might soon be expected, and large bodies of the people came out to meet him. Before dinner he received a letter, from a parish priest of the church of St Sebaldus, requesting an interview with him, to which he cheerfully consented. During dinner a note was handed to him by one of his attendants, Wenzel, of Duba, purporting that, in consequence of the notice he had posted up, many citizens and masters wished to speak with him.

1 Mikowec, 2, Letter, of the 16th of Nov., 1414.
2 Opp. i., fol. 57, 2; ep. 3.

This, too, was welcome tidings. He left his table for the purpose of conversing with them. The masters were for having a private interview, because they had scruples about the propriety of speaking on such matters before laymen. But Huss would listen to no such proposal of discussing matters of faith privately, declaring that he had always testified of gospel truth openly, and meant to do so still. In presence of the burgomaster and many citizens, he conversed about his doctrine till night-fall, and his hearers professed to be satisfied with him. If Huss sought to approve himself as a genuine witness of gospel truth, before all the world, we surely ought not to look upon this as an ambitious effort on his part to court the approbation of the many; unless we are disposed to raise the same objection against *every* zealous preacher of evangelical truth; which, to be sure, is often done. While Huss was disputing with certain persons in the little Suabian town of Bibrach, the noble Knight John, of Chlum, took so lively an interest in this disputation, and spoke with so much warmth in favour of the doctrines of Huss, that he was taken for a doctor of theology; hence Huss was wont, afterwards in his letters, playfully to call him the Doctor of Bibrach.[1] Well aware of the great ignorance of the people in the things of religion, Huss was accustomed wherever he lodged to leave for his hosts on departing a copy of the Ten Commandments, or even to write them in the meal, as he had written them on the walls of Bethlehem Chapel.

He reached Constance, on the third of November, some days after the arrival of Pope John, whom he met on the way.

During the first four weeks, which Huss spent at Constance, nothing was proposed or said with regard to his affair. He would have found no friends, he writes, in Constance, if his adversaries from Bohemia had not taken pains to make him hated.[2] Meantime his most violent enemies, the already mentioned Michael de Causis, Paletz, and the prime author of all the last commotions in Prague, the man who as papal legate had brought to Bohemia the bull of indulgence and crusade, Wenzel

1 Ibid. fol. 71, 1; ep. 45 in the marginal note.
2 Mikowec, 2, Letter.

Tiem, formerly dean, then provost of Passau, had also arrived.[1] These persons set everything in motion against him. Michael de Causis, on the next day after his arrival, caused a notice to be posted on all the churches, accusing him as the vilest heretic. His opponents brought with them the writings which he had composed during the last disputes and attempts at compromise; writings in which he had most freely expressed his opinions; and these they now put in circulation. These were especially to be used against him. The form of accusation, drawn up by Michael de Causis, was well calculated to arouse against Huss the anxious suspicions of the hierarchy. Assertions ascribed wrongly to Huss, and assertions which had really been made by him, were lumped together; and his accuser declares, that if he should be acquitted, the clergy in Bohemia must suffer grievous persecutions in their property and persons: everything would be turned to confusion, and the evil would spread through all Germany; and such a persecution of the clergy and the faithful would ensue, as had never been known since the days of Constantine. If he should in any way get safely out of the hands of the council, he and his adherents would have it to say, that his doctrines must have been approved by the council. The princes and laity generally would fall upon the clergy, as they had already done in Bohemia, and as they were generally inclined to do.[2] The pope sent as his delegate to Huss, the bishop of Constance, accompanied by his officials, and the *Auditor sacri palatii*, a high officer of the papal court. They informed him it had been with the pope a matter of much deliberation how to dispose of the interdict pronounced on the place where he resided. Finally, the pope had concluded to resort to the pope's plenitude of power, and to suspend the interdict and the ban for the present. It was only requested that, in order to avoid giving scandal, he would keep away from mass and other church solemnities; in all other respects, he should have liberty to go wherever he pleased. But Huss had never relinquished

1 Words of Huss: Multi adversarii et fortes insurgunt contra me, quos praesertim concitat venditor indulgentiarum, Pathaviensis decanus. Opp. i. fol. 58, 2; ep. 6.

2 Hist. Hussi, opp. i. fol. 6 sq.

his right, as a priest, to hold mass; nor did he mean to do it now;—a pertinacity, which could not fail to give great offence to the hierarchical party.[1] When many of the friends of Huss, protesting to his innocence, urged the pope to retract all that had hitherto been done in the matter, he gave an evasive answer, laying all the blame on the enemies of Huss in Bohemia, who refused to take back anything, but warmly persisted in their accusations against him.[2] Yet many no doubt were anxious that the whole affair should be settled *before* it was brought up as a matter for public deliberation. And perhaps Huss, if he could have been prevailed upon to humble himself before the papal authority, and to give in a recantation of the heresies of which he had been accused, might have secured to himself this advantage. Two bishops and a doctor of theology actually made to him a proposition of this sort.[3] But Huss would consent to nothing like it. He wanted a public hearing before the assembled council; before that council he felt impelled to give in the account of his faith, and bear witness of the truth, for which he contended. He hoped that nothing would be done in his affair until the Emperor Sigismund should arrive, who had already caused him to be informed of his satisfaction at learning that he had started on his journey without waiting for the letter of safe-conduct, which had first reached him in Constance. When the emperor arrived he hoped by his intercession to obtain a public hearing.[4] Though he could not foresee what was to be the issue, and was far from amusing himself with any false hopes, yet trust in God and in his truth raised him even now above all fear, and regarding himself simply as an instrument of that truth, he confidently expected that it would come forth triumphant out of every conflict. "Assuredly"—says he

1 Words of the Magister Joh. Cardinalis of Reinstein: Magister quotidie divina peragit et in tota via peregit hucusque. Opp. i. fol. 58, 1; ep. 4.

2 Papa non vult tollere processus et dixit: Quid ego possum tamen? vestri faciunt. Ibid. fol. 58, 2; ep. 6.

3 Sed locuti sunt duo episcopi et unus doctor cum Jo. Lepka, quod ego sub silentio eos ordarem. Ibid.

4 Huss remarks of one of the knights: D. Latzembock injunxit mihi, quod ante adventum regis nihil attentem quoad actus. Et spero, quod respondebo in publica audientia. Ibid. ep. 5. Observing that men feared his public answer, he adds: Quam spero de dei gratia, quod sim eam consecuturus, dum rex Sigismundus adfuerit. Ibid. ep. 6.

in a latter to Prague—"Christ is with me as a strong champion; therefore fear I not what the enemy may do to me." He says, speaking of the plots of his enemies: "I fear nothing; for I hope that, after a great conflict, will ensue a great victory, and after the victory a still greater reward, and a still greater discomfiture of my enemies."[1]

Relying upon the expectation that he would be permitted to speak before the assembled council, he availed himself of his leisure at Constance in preparing several discourses which he meant to deliver on that occasion. Accordingly we find a discourse in which he designed to give an account of his faith.[2] He testified in it his assent to the church confession of faith; appealing to the fact that the Apostle's Creed had been inscribed by him on the walls of Bethlehem chapel.[3] He declares, too, that it was not his design to teach anything contrary to the decisions of the general councils, or contrary to the ancient canon and the authority of the approved church teachers; always presupposing, however, that they asserted nothing but what was contained, *implicite* or *explicite*, in the sacred Scriptures.[4] And since his disputes on the matter of indulgence had given occasion to the charge brought against him by some, that he did not acknowledge the common fund of the merits of the saints; since he was accused of contending against the veneration of the saints, their intercession, the veneration of Mary, he vindicates himself, as he could with truth and propriety do, against all such accusations. With regard to several of these doctrines, he was not conscious as yet of the contradiction in which they stood with his biblical principles. All this would, in time, have more clearly developed itself to his understanding if he had been permitted to continue his labours for a longer period; and as to that matter, his opponents may doubtless have seen, more distinctly than he himself did, to what his principles were leading. With regard to several other points, which also had something to rest

1 Ibid.

2 De fidei suae elucidatione.

3 Symbolum plebem docui, et ipsum in pariete capellae, in qua praedicavi, describere praecepi vulgariter. Opp. i., fol. 51, 2.

4 Veneror etiam omnia concilia generalia et specialia, decreta et decretales, et omnes leges, canones et constitutiones: de quanto consonant explicite vel implicite legi dei. Ibid. fol. 48, 2.

upon in the purely Christian consciousness, he never, perhaps, would have been led to oppose the doctrine of the church even by a still further development of his principles; for, in defining the doctrine of the community of saints, a doctrine which he also believed was taught in the New Testament (Eph. iv. 3, 15; 1 Cor. iii. 4 ff.), he says: "This communion of the saints is a participation in all the good which belongs to all the members of the mystical body of Christ, so long as they are found in a state of grace." From this he argues that the glorified saints assist and sustain the elect on the earth, take joy in their repentance and their progress, just as the saints on earth assist those who are passing through the refining process of the purgatorial fire, with their prayers, their good works, their fasts and alms, so that they are more speedily delivered out of this state and brought up to their heavenly home. "And as I heartily believe"—he goes on to say—"in this community of saints, and have now publicly avowed it with my lips, so I entreat the most gracious Lord Jesus Christ, who never refuses his grace to the truly penitent, that he would forgive the sin of those who, privately or publicly, have said of me that I denied the doctrine of the intercession of saints, whether in relation to those who go on pilgrimages, or those who have died in grace." He argues this from the fellowship of all the members of the body of Christ with one another, where one sustains the other; adducing as proof those cases in Scripture where the centurion's intercession with Christ had benefited his servant, and where the Syrophenician woman had helped her daughter, and then goes on to argue: "If a saint on earth, still affected with sin, can benefit another believer and the whole church by his intercession, how foolish it would be to say that one who is present with Christ in glory could not do the same." The second discourse relates to the restoration of peace. He distinguishes three kinds of peace,—peace with God, with ourselves, and with our neighbour. The first he considers to be the foundation of all other peace. He then makes a like threefold distinction in speaking of the assembly which had been convoked for the restoration of peace, describing peace with God as having its foundation in supreme love to God in the church; peace with ourselves as consisting in this, that the church should govern itself in holiness; peace with our neighbour, that it should

satisfy every neighbour in all that is requisite for his eternal welfare. To deficiency in the first, he traces all failure in respect to the last. The worldliness of the church he designates as the ground of corruption and schism; giving special prominence to the corruption of the clergy. The evil was bad enough already, when they failed in that which constitutes the chief end of their vocation, to hold forth the word of God to the laity. When priests neglected this, they were already angels of darkness, clothing themselves like angels of light; servants of antichrist, not servants of Christ; and their neglect to study the divine word, their want of fidelity to that word, was the source of all the other corruptions, which he then goes on to portray.[1] Again, as Huss had been accused of rejecting the authority of church traditions and of the ecclesiastical laws, of disturbing the foundations of ecclesiastical and civil order, it was his wish to explain, in a discourse before the council, the sense of the propositions really expressed by him and perverted by his opponents. This he did in his discourse on the sufficiency of the law of Christ for the guidance of the church,[2] where we shall recognize a great deal that corresponds with the doctrines of Matthias of Janow. He begins with saying: "I, an ignorant man, being about to speak before the wise of all the world, entreat you by the mercy of Jesus Christ, true God and true man, that you would calmly listen to me. For I know from the words of Nicodemus (John vii. 51) that the law judgeth no man before it hear him and know what he doeth. I, the poorest of priests, will however endeavour, as I have aforetime endeavoured, to carry out the law of Christ in myself, by taking heed, so far as the grace of God enables me, against revenge, envy, and vain-glory; since from my heart I strive only for the glory of God, the confession of his truth, the banishment of all evil thoughts against my neighbour, and the defence of the law of Christ. For I am bound carefully, humbly, and patiently to defend the most excellent law of Christ, as Christ himself and his disciples did the same." "As I have often said before"—he adds—"so now too I solemnly protest, that I never have and never will pertinaciously affirm anything which is contrary to the truth of faith. I hold

[1] De pace, opp. i. fol. 52 sq.

[2] De sufficientia legis Christi ad regendam ecclesiam.

firmly all the truths of faith, as I have ever firmly held them and am resolved that I will ever firmly hold them; so that, rather than defend an error opposed to them, I would prefer, hoping in the Lord and with his help, to suffer a terrible punishment of death; nay, sustained by the grace of God, I am ready to give up this poor life for the law of Christ. As I have in my academical answer and acts and in my public preaching often submitted, so now too I submit and will in the future humbly submit myself to the order of this most holy law, to the atonement by the same, and to obedience to it; ready to retract anything whatever that I have said, when I am taught that it is contrary to truth." In the prosecution of his theme he takes notice of an objection, namely, that, according to the above supposition of the sufficiency of the law of Christ, all other laws would be superfluous, and ought therefore to be done away with. He disposes of this objection by referring all other laws to this *one* law, by holding that they are to be regarded only as dependant on the latter, their force consisting in their harmony and correspondence with the same. All other laws were, in their principle, contained *implicite* in this law, were only the evolution of this law, or simply designed to establish and promote its claims in all circumstances and relations; therefore, subservient to it. "Human laws"—says he—"are included in the divine law; nay, they are themselves the law of Christ in so far as they are subservient to this law." Of the "canon law," he remarks that it was partly derived from the divine law, and partly akin to the civil law, and included in both these parts. Civil laws had been created by occasion of the sins of mankind, for the purpose of securing forcibly the state of justice in the commonwealth, so far as it concerned earthly goods; while the evangelical law was designed for the preservation of goods in the kingdom of grace. Accordingly he is of the opinion that everything else should be made subservient to Christianity; because the trades, professions, and liberal arts should all be regulated with reference to the law of Christ as the highest end, should be subservient to that law; the trades, and professions, in preparing what is requisite for the supply of bodily wants; the liberal arts, in promoting the understanding of the Holy Scriptures.[1] But the expectation of Huss,

1 De suffic. leg. Christi, opp. i., fol. 44, 2 sq.

that he would have liberty to speak freely before the assembled council, was not fulfilled. The intrigues of his enemies; the tickets sent about, by his friends or his enemies, announcing that he would appear and preach in public on a certain Sunday;[1] the fear that Huss might escape from Constance, a rumour to this effect having already got abroad;[2] the uncompromising zeal with which he unfolded and explained his principles before all who visited him in his place of abode; all these things co-operated to bring it about that, on the 28th of November, 1414, Huss was deprived of his liberty.

On that day, towards noon, an embassy from the pope and cardinals, consisting of the bishops of Augsburg and Trent, the burgomaster of Constance, and the lord Hans of Baden, visited Huss, with

1 It was an announcement of this sort, that whoever would come to church to hear him on this particular Sunday, should have a ducat. Master Cardinalis of Reinstein, who reports the fact, does not himself decide, whether this was done by a friend or an enemy: Alias nescitur, an amicus vel inimicus heri intimavit in ecclesia, quia Hus dominica proxima praedicabit ad clerum in ecclesia Constantiensi, et cuilibet praesenti dabit unum ducatum. Opp. i., fol. 58, 1; ep. 4. And among the articles of complaint afterwards brought against Huss, one was that he had preached openly. V. d. Hardt iv., p. 213.

2 It is plain how this rumour arose when we compare what Palacky (iii. 1, p. 321 note) has communicated from the manuscript report of Peter of Mladenowic, the freshest and most trustworthy witness, who was at that time in the vicinity of Huss. A hay-waggon covered with canvas had left the city and afterwards returned without the covering. Hence it was subsequently noised abroad that Huss had been concealed under the canvas. The canonical Ulrich of Reichenthal, and the court-martial Dacher, in their histories of the council of Constance, are cited as witnesses of the flight of Huss. To say nothing of the confusion of dates in the former, it is easy to see how he may have been deceived by the rumour; and their histories, having been drawn up long after the time of the events, are on this account the less worthy to be relied on as vouchers for facts. The silence of Huss and of his accusers with regard to any such event is assuredly the most certain testimony of his innocence. As everything was raked up which could possibly be made use of against him, as there was so great a desire especially to smooth over the affair of his imprisonment, they certainly would not have neglected to mention any such attempt of Huss to escape, if such a thing had in any way been possible. In particular, his violent enemy, the already mentioned bishop John of Leitomysl, who spared no pains in bringing together facts to justify his conduct towards Huss, would never have omitted to take notice of this flight. But all he has to say against Huss in this regard, is that he preached publicly at Constance. But even this could be disputed by the knight of Chlum, who solemnly affirmed that Huss had never left his quarters during the whole time of his abode in Constance. He denies, quod ipse Hus a tempore adventus sui ad hanc civitatem usque ad diem et tempus captivatis suae unum passum extra domum hospitii exiisset (V. d. Hardt iv. 213). It is plain, therefore, —and the same thing has been already shown by Palacky in the passages cited on a

whom his faithful friend the knight of Chlum happened then to be present. The envoys told him it was now agreed to give him the hearing which he had so often demanded, and he was invited to follow the embassy into the pope's palace. The knight of Chlum, who at once saw through the motives of the whole arrangement, rose with indignation and exclaimed: Such a violation of the honour of the emperor and of the holy Roman empire was not to be tolerated. The emperor had given his own word to Huss that he should obtain a free hearing at the counsel. He himself, who had received it in charge to watch over the safety of Huss, was responsible for that charge and bound to see that nothing was done against the emperor's word. He could not permit this, and must protest against such a proceeding. The cardinals would do well to consider what they were about, and not suppose that they could be allowed to trifle with the honour of the emperor and of the empire. The bishop of Trent here interposed: They had no bad intentions whatever. Everything should be done in peace; they wished only to avoid making a stir. Huss now took up the word and declared that he had not come there to appear before the pope and Roman court, but to appear before the whole assembled council, to give in their presence an account of his faith; yet he was ready to appear and testify of his faith also before the cardinals. Though they used force against him, still he had a firm hope in God's grace that they never would succeed in inducing him to fall from the truth. Saying this, Huss followed the embassy. On the lower floor, he was met by the mistress of the house, who took leave of him in tears. Struck with a presentiment of death, and deeply moved, he bestowed on her his blessing. Mounting on horseback he proceeded, with the embassy and the knight of Chlum, to the court. The prelates, fearing a a movement on the part of the people, had taken care that the city magistrates, who were completely subservient to the council, should place soldiers in the neighbouring streets, so that if neces-

former page—how entirely without foundation the story about the attempt of Huss to escape is represented by Aschbach, as a credible one in his History of the Emperor Sigismund, (ii. 32); not to mention, that he describes it as having occurred at a time when it could not have occurred, viz., in the interval between the appearance of Huss before the papal chancery and his return to his quarters; for, as we have seen, no such return ever took place.

sary the step might be carried through by force. When Huss appeared before the chancery, the president of the college of cardinals said. It was reported of him that he publicly taught many and grievous heresies, and disseminated them in all Bohemia. The thing could not be allowed to go on so any longer; hence he had been sent for, with a view to learn from himself how the matter stood. To this Huss replied, that such was his mind, he would prefer to die rather than to teach *one* heresy, not to say *many;* and the very reason for which he had come there was to make himself answerable to the council and to recant if he could be convicted before it of holding any error. The cardinals expressed their satisfaction at the temper of mind here manifested by Huss. They then adjourned, leaving Huss and Chlum under the surveillance of the men at arms. About four o'clock in the afternoon they again assembled in chancery, and several Bohemians were also in attendance, both enemies and friends of Huss: among the former, Paletz and Michael de Causis; among the latter, the already named John Cardinalis. The former did their utmost to prevent Huss from being set at liberty; and having gained their object, burst into a loud murmur of applause, crying out insultingly to Huss: "Now we have you, nor shall you escape till you have paid the uttermost farthing." That John of Reinstein was already well known as a skilful diplomatist, who had frequently been employed by King Wenzel in transacting business with the Roman chancery. Hence he is *said* to have derived his appellation Cardinalis, which was first a nick-name, but afterwards retained by him. Paletz now reminded him of the injury done to his reputation by his connection with the Hussite heresy: he who once enjoyed so much influence with the cardinals, had now become a mere cipher. The master replied: "Keep your pity for yourself; if you knew any evil of me, you might have cause to pity me." And thus they separated. Towards evening, it was intimated to Chlum that he might retire to his lodgings; Huss must remain there. Filled with indignation, Chlum hastened away to the pope, who happened to be still present in the assembly. He overwhelmed him with reproaches that he had dared thus to trifle with the word of the emperor, that he had thus deceived him. He held up to him the inconsistency between his conduct and his promises; for he had assured him and another

Bohemian, his uncle Henry of Latzembock, that Huss should be safe, even though he had killed the pope's brother. The pope, however, exculpated himself by saying that *he* had nothing to do with the imprisonment of Huss. He referred to the cardinals as responsible for the whole transaction. "You know very well" —said he—"the terms on which I stand with them." And true enough it was, indeed, as may be gathered from the preceding narrative, that the pope stood entirely at the mercy of the cardinals, and in his present dubious position was compelled to comply with all their wishes. He certainly had much more to do in looking after his own personal interests than after the conformity of others to the orthodox faith. The same night Huss was conducted to the house of a canonical priest in Constance, where he remained eight days under the surveillance of an armed guard. On the 6th of December he was conveyed to a Dominican cloister on the Rhine, and thrown into a narrow dungeon filled with pestiferous effluvia from a neighbouring sink.

The knight of Chlum did not cease to complain of the violation done to the emperor's safe-conduct. He immediately reported the whole proceeding to the emperor. The latter expressed his indignation at it, demanded that Huss should be set free, and threatened to break into the prison by force, if the doors were not voluntarily thrown open.[1] On the 24th of December, Chlum, in the name of the emperor, publicly posted up a certificate, declaring, in the most emphatic language, that the pope had been false to his promise, that he had presumed to insult the authority of the emperor and of the empire, by paying no regard whatever to the emperor's demands. When the emperor himself should come to Constance, and it was announced that he might be expected the next day, it would be seen what his indignation was at learning of such violation of his majesty.[2] After such declarations it may well be asked, what did the emperor really

1 V. d. Hardt iv., pag. 26.

2 Chlum says in this declaration: Quapropter ego regio nomine manifesto, quod detentio et captio dicti Hus est facta contra regis omnimodam voluntatem, cum sit in contemptum suorum salvi conductus et protectionis imperii facta, eo quod pro tunc dictus dominus meus a Constantia longe distabat, et si interfuisset, nunquam hoc permisisset. Cum autem venerit, quilibet sentire debebit ipsum de vilipensione sibi et suae et imperii protectionis ac salvo illata conductui, dolorosius molestari. V. d. Hardt iv., p. 28.

mean by all this? How far was he in earnest; and how far merely acting a part and pretending anger from motives of policy? That he had an interest in representing himself to be more annoyed and angry than he really was, and in uttering threats which he never meant to fulfil, is evident. For it behoved him to do all he could to remove from himself the reproach of a want of good faith,[1] and to sooth the highly irritated temper of the important party of Huss in Bohemia, and of the knights who espoused his cause most decidedly. But still there is no evidence from facts to justify any such supposition. For, if the emperor took no further steps to procure the release of Huss, still this would not amount to a proof of his insincerity. If he did not do this, he did something else. He had an honest intention to abide by his imperial word; he was at first really annoyed, that it had been presumed so grievously to violate it; and he was supposed to have sufficient freedom of mind and firmness of character to defy the spirit of the times, so far as to carry through what he had considered to be just and right, in spite of the authority which was held to be the most sacred in the church. Indeed, Pope John afterwards particularly brought it forward, as we have mentioned on a former page, in complaint of the emperor, and in exculpation of his own flight from Constance, that the emperor restrained the liberty of the council, in transacting business relative to the faith, and would not let justice have its course. But, leaving the emperor's declarations entirely out of view, we should certainly take into account the great influence which the power of the church exercised over him. When, on the 1st of January, a deputation of the council appeared before the emperor, and declared to him that he ought not to interfere in transactions relative to matters of faith, that the council must have its full liberty in the investigation of heresies, and in its proceedings against heretics, Sigismund no longer ventured to resist, and promised the council that he would allow them all liberty and never interpose his authority in these matters.[2] In truth, had the emperor been disposed to

1 If the Imperial salvus conductus had been nothing but a pass made out by the emperor, as modern historical sophists assert, there would, indeed, have been no need of all this.

2 V. d. Hardt iv., pag. 32.

insist farther on the liberation of Huss, it might easily have led to consequences most perilous to the future proceedings of the council.* The pope might have taken advantage of this to gain over a large party to his interests, and the seeds of schism, which, as we have before seen, were already present in the council, would doubtless have gone on to multiply, till they brought on an open breach, and, perhaps, a breaking up of the council. There is certainly much that is true in the vindication of himself by the Emperor Sigismund against the Bohemian estates, who espoused the cause of Huss, when, in the year 1417, he writes: "If Huss had, in the first instance, come to him, and had gone with him to Constance, his affair would perhaps have had a quite different turn. And, God knows, that we experienced on his account and at his fall, a sorrow and pain too great to be expressed by words. And all the Bohemians that were then with us certainly knew, how we interceded for him, and that several times, seized with indignation, we left the council. Nay, on his account, we went away from Constance, till they declared to us, If we would not allow justice to be executed at the council, they knew not what business they had to be there. Thus we verily thought that we could do nothing further in this affair. Nor could we even speak about it, for had we done so, the council would have entirely broken up."[1]

The preliminary examinations of the process against Huss were now to begin, in the order in which the complaints had been brought against him by Paletz, Michael de Causis, and others; and for this purpose, on the 1st December, a committee was nominated, which consisted of the patriarch John, of Constantinople, the bishop John of Lubeck,[2] and Bernhard of Citta di Castello. To these men the pope committed the affair by a constitution in which he already names Huss as a dangerous heretic, who was spreading abroad mischievous errors, and had seduced many; and charged them to report the result of their examination to the council, that the latter might pass a definitive sentence on Huss, in conformity thereto.[3] The agreement of these two testimonies is decisive against the statement of Her-

1 Cochlacus, pag. 157.

2 Palacky, p. 330 has, after Mladenowic, bishop of Lebus.

3 Raynaldi annales vol. 1, 1414, s. 10 ff.

mann v. d. Hardt, who, following the report of Cerretanus, describes the commission differently. Huss demanded of the committee a solicitor; but to a heretic no such privilege could be granted; and it was refused him. Huss thereupon said to his judges: "Well, then, let the Lord Jesus be my advocate, who also will soon be your judge."[1] A severe taunt on the council, was an expression afterwards uttered by a Parisian deputy in connection with another affair, which was to this effect, that if Huss had been allowed an advocate, they would never have been able to convict him of heresy.[2] The unhealthy locality of his prison brought upon Huss a severe fit of sickness, fever connected with an affection of the bladder, which it was feared he could not survive. The pope sent him his own body physician; for it was not desired that he should die a natural death. Through the intercession of his friends he was permitted to exchange his cell for more airy rooms in the same convent, which was now assigned to him as his prison. Here he was attacked with a new access of that severe distemper, after having spent eight weeks in his prison, as appears from his own words: "I have been a second time dreadfully tormented with an affection of my bladder, which I never had before, and with severe vomiting and fever; my keepers feared I should die; and they have led me out of my prison, (probably only for a few moments to enjoy the fresh air)."[3] His keepers were, for the most part, very kind to him;[4] hence, to show his gratitude, he afterwards composed for them a few papers on practical Christianity. In

1 We take this from the words of Huss himself: Cogitationem de objiciendis commisi domino deo, ad quem appellavi, quem judicem, procuratorem et advocatum mihi clegi coram commissariis, expresse dicens: Dominus Jesus meus advocatus sit et procurator, qui vos omnes brevi judicabit. Opp. i., fol. 71, 2; ep. 46. Further: Item sciatis, quod coram testibus et notaris in carcere petivi commissaris, ut mihi deputarent procuratorem et advocatum, qui promiserunt et postea dare noluerunt, Ego commisi me domino Jesu Christo, ut ipse procuret et advocet et judicet causam meam. Ibid. fol. 72, 2; ep. 49.

2 Joannes Hus haereticus declaratus et condemnatus per sacrum concilium generale si habuisset advocatum, nunquam fuisset convictus. Acta in conc. Const. circa damnat. Joann. Parvi. Gerson, opp. v., pag. 444.

3 Words of Huss: Cras octo hebdomae ernut, quod Hus posita est ad refectorium. —Nam iterum horribiliter fui vexatus per calculum, quem nunquam prius passus sum, et gravem vomitum et febres. Jam custodes timebant, ne morerer, qui eduxerunt me de carcere. Opp. i, fol. 74, 1 et 73, 2; ep. 51.

4 So says Huss himself: Omnes clerici camerae domini papae et omnes custodes valde pie me tractant. Ibid. fol. 74, 1; ep. 52.

fetters, and amidst these severe sufferings, he was obliged to draw up his answers to the complaints brought against him by Michael de Causis and Paletz. It was not without deep pain he found out that they used against him passages from intercepted letters, in part distorted, and familiar expressions which he had dropped in conversation with theologians, who had formerly been his friends, and afterwards deserted him.[1] Huss, to whom, as we shall presently see, it was a source of great disappointment and mortification, that he could not succeed in obtaining a hearing from the council, had complained of this in a letter to Jacobellus, of Misa, and told him that he had learned from the mouth of his enemies that he could not obtain a public hearing, except by paying 2000 ducats to the people of the Roman court, whom he styled servants of antichrist. This letter his enemies' spies contrived to get into their hands, as well as a letter by Jacobellus, who reflected severely on the conduct of the council. Both were to be used against him; and both were laid before him. This system of espionage and the indiscretion of his friends bore heavily on the spirits of Huss, and he writes that this Jacobellus, who was the loudest to warn against hypocrites, was the man who suffered himself to be most deceived by them. Paletz visited him during his first illness as an accuser; the sufferings of his old friend could not move him to relent. He never spoke to him, in the presence of the commission, but in the harshest language—language calculated to arouse prejudice and suspicion—such as that, since the time of Christ, more dangerous heretics than Wicklif and Huss had not appeared: all that ever attended his preaching were infected with the disposition to deny the doctrine of transubstantiation. Said Huss to him: Sad greeting do you give me, and sadly do you sin against your own soul! Look; perhaps, I am to die; or, should I recover my health, to be burned; what return will you then get for all this in Bohemia?"[2] He speaks of Paletz, generally, as his fiercest enemy, who did

[1] Nam Michael et literas et alia explorat, et Paletz illa antiqua, quae locuti sumus ante multos annos, articulat. Ibid. fol. 72, 2; ep. 48.

[2] In the first letter in which Huss says anything about this, the one written during his sickness, he writes concerning Paletz: Qui me jacentem in infirmitate coram multis salutavit salutatione horribilissima, quam postea dicam vobis, si deo placuerit. Ibid. fol. 71, 2; ep. 46. He quotes his very language, ibid. fol. 68, 2; ep. 33.

him the most injury. He had, for example, strenuously urged that all the adherents of Huss should be cited and forced to an abjuration of heresy. Huss, adverting to this, says: "May God Almighty pardon him!"[1] The profound impression which the treatment experienced from his former friend made on the tender sensibilities of Huss, appears from several of his letters. "Never in my whole life"—says he—"did I receive from any man harsher words of comfort than from Paletz."[2] And, in words of St Jerome, he describes how beyond all other wrong it must needs wound the heart, to see love converted into hate in one who has the wrong all on his own side.[3] In a letter of the 20th of January, 1415, he says: "God has appointed me those for my inflexible enemies, to whom I have shown much kindness, and whom I loved from my very heart."[4] He found himself situated like the Apostle Paul, when he wrote the epistle to the Philippians, partly filled with forebodings of death, partly cherishing the expectation that God would by his own almighty power deliver him from the prison, and bring him back again to his flock. However it might turn, he was resigned to the divine will; as he says in a letter written on the 20th of January, 1415: "His will be done, whether it please him to take me to himself, or to bring me back to you."[5] "At one time God comforts, at another afflicts me"—he writes to John of Chlum—"but I hope that he is ever with me in my sufferings."[6] "The Lord delivered Jonas out of the belly of the whale"—he says in another letter—"Daniel from the lion's den, the three men from the fiery furnace, Susanna from the court of the false witnesses; and he can deliver me, too, if it please him, for the glory of his name and for the preaching of the word. But, if the death comes, which is precious in the eyes of the Lord, then let the name of the Lord be praised!"[7] To Peter of Mladenowic he writes:

1 Ibid. fol. 75, 1; ep. 54. 2 Ibid. fol. 74, 1; ep. 52.

3 He quotes the language of Jerome: Plus vero in nobis ea tormenta saeviunt, quae ab illis patimur, de quorum mentibus praesumebamus, quia cum damno corporis mala nos cruciant amissae caritatis. Et patet dolor meus ex parte Paletz. Ibid. fol. 71, 2; ep. 46.

4 See Mikowec, l. c., Letter 3. In the Latin edition,—opp. 1, fol. 59, 2; ep. 10,—this passage is wanting.

5 Mikowec, Letter 3. Opp. 1, fol. 60, 1; ep. 10.

6 Opp. i. fol. 73, 2; ep. 51. 7 Ibid. fol. 74, 1; ep. 52.

"And by the grace of God, my return to Prague is not a thing impossible; still I have no desire for it, unless it be according to the will of the Lord in heaven."[1] He was filled constantly with a prophetic consciousness, that whatever might be the issue of his own case, truth would triumph, and go on to reveal itself more gloriously and mightily; as he says: "I hope that what I have spoken in secret will be proclaimed on the housetops."[2] It is remarkable that this prophetic consciousness was reflected also in his dreams so as to react cheerfully upon his feelings. He told the following dreams which he had in the earlier times of his imprisonment to the knight of Chlum. He dreamt that certain persons resolved to destroy all the pictures of Christ on the walls of Bethlehem chapel; and they did it. On arising next day he beheld many painters, who had drawn more pictures and more beautiful ones than there were before, which he gazed on with rapture. And said the painters to the concourse of people; Now, let the bishops and priests come and destroy these pictures! And a great multitude of people in Bethlehem joyed over it, and he rejoiced with them, and amidst the laughter he woke up. And they had indeed already scattered it about among many, that they meant to destroy the inscriptions on the walls. The knight of Chlum, in his answer to this letter, exhorted him, first of all, to dismiss all these fancies for the present, and whatever else might occupy his mind, and confine his attention simply to one object, namely, how he might best reply to the articles of complaint. But, he added, "The truth, which cannot deceive, forbids that you should feel any solicitude about this;" and he refers to Matthew x. 19. Then, in compliance with the invitation of Huss, he expounds his dream, as follows: "The picture of Christ painted on the wall of Bethlehem chapel is the life of Christ which we are to imitate; the immovable words of Holy Scripture, which are there inscribed, are his words which we are to follow. The enemies of the cross of Christ seek to destroy both in the night, because the Sun of Righteousness has gone down to them by reason of their wicked lives; and they seek to bring both into oblivion among men.

[1] Ibid. fol. 66, 2; ep. 29.

[2] Ibid. fol. 72, 2; ep. 48.

But, at the morning dawn, when the Sun of Righteousness arises, the preachers restore both after a more glorious manner, proclaiming that which had been said in the ear, and was nearly forgotten, from the housetops. And from all this will proceed great joy to Christendom. And though the "goose" is now brought down by sickness, and may next be laid a sacrifice on the altar,[1] yet will she hereafter, awaking as it were from the sleep of this life, with Him who dwells in Heaven, laugh and hold them in derision, who are the destroyers at once of Christ's image and of Scripture. Nay, even in this present life, she will, with God's help, still restore those pictures and those words of Scripture to the flock and her friends with glowing zeal." Huss, in his answer, assures the knight of Chlum of his agreement with this explanation, and goes on to say: "Though Cato tells us, that we ought not to care for dreams, and though God's commandment settles it fast that we ought not to pry into the interpretation of dreams, yet I hope that the life of Christ, which by my preaching in Bethlehem has been transcribed upon the hearts of men, and which they meant to destroy there, first, by forbidding preaching in the chapels and in Bethlehem; next, by tearing down Bethlehem itself,—that this life of Christ will be better transcribed by a greater number of better preachers than I am, to the joy of the people who love the life of Christ, over which I shall, as the Doctor of Bibrach says, rejoice when I awake, that is rise, from the dead."[2] As we may conjecture from pope John's letter to the commission appointed to inquire into the affair of Huss, it probably had not been intended at the outset to grant him a public hearing, but they would have preferred to dispose of the matter by private management; the council was to give the final decision according to the report of the committee. The proposition was made to Huss, that he should submit to the decision of twelve or thirteen masters. According to the

1 We have thus endeavoured to make out the sense of the words which were probably badly translated into Latin.

[The Latin words are: Et auca licet in ara posita, nunc posita infirma carne tristabitur, in futuro tamen etc., and might perhaps be rendered: "And though the goose, offered upon the altar, is at present depressed on account of the laying off her frail flesh, yet hereafter, etc.]

2 Ibid. fol. 71; ep. 44, 45, 46.

prevailing church theory which taught that the individual must renounce his own will, and submit to an authority without himself, it might be expected that a man would readily consent to fulfil this duty of subordination, in respect also to matters of conviction. But Huss, of course, with the views which he entertained of the relation of every individual to Christ, and of the rights of reason grounded in that relation, could never accept such a proposition as that. But he submitted a protest, demanding leave to render an account of his faith before the whole council.[1] This was the point to secure which the effort of his friends were ever most earnestly solicited, and it was one which he hoped, through the support of these friends among the Bohemian knights, he should succeed in securing. He wished, as he expressed it in a petition addressed to the council through the president of the committee, to have the liberty either to defend his doctrine after the scholastic fashion before the council, or else to preach before them. But he did not expect that the president of that committee would actually present his petition to the council.[2] When, after he had submitted his explanations on the several articles, he was asked whether he would defend them, he threw himself in reference to the whole on the decision of the council; but, without doubt, on the pre-supposition that the council would decide according to the word of God, and in whatever respects he erred,—for, that he had erred in some respects he ever thought to be possible,—would point out his error by that word. So he declared, defending himself, perhaps, against the reproaches of friends, who may have expressed their dissatisfaction with a submission so liable to misinterpretation.[3] "Behold, I call God to witness, that no other answer seemed to me at that time more suitable; for, I had written it down with my own hand, that I would defend nothing, pertinaciously, but was ready to be taught by any man."[4] He expresses it as his wish, if he should appear before the council, that he might be allowed to have his station

1 Ibid. fol. 74, 1; ep. 52.

2 Ibid. fol. 74, 2; ep. 54.

3 Chlum had written to him: "Your friends, especially Jesenic, are troubled on account of the answer which you gave in your cell. But what has been done cannot be altered. Ibid. fol 72, 1; ep. 47.

4 Ibid. fol. 72, 2; ep. 48.

near the emperor, so that he could hear and understand him well; and also near to the knight of Chlum and his other friends, "In order"—he writes—"that you may hear what the Lord Jesus Christ, my advocate, counsellor, and most gracious judge, will inspire me to speak, and thus whether I am suffered to live, or must die, you may be true and well-informed witnesses, and liars may not have it to say that I deviated in the least from the truth which I preached."[1] He requests the knight of Chlum to ask the emperor that he might be released from his close confinement, so as to be at liberty to make suitable preparation for his public trial. "Pray the emperor"—he writes—"that for my sake, and for the vindication of the cause of justice and truth to the glory of God and the advancement of the church, he would take me from prison, so that I may have liberty to prepare myself for my public hearing."[2] Huss says, it was particularly urged against him, that he had hindered the announcement of the crusade-bull; that he had continued for so long a time under the ban, and still persisted in saying mass; that he had appealed from the pope to Christ. This appeal, as he writes, they read out before him; and with joy and a smile on his lips he acknowledged it to be his.[3] When they, furthermore, declared that the opinions which he had advanced, and of which we have already spoken, concerning the right of princes to deprive the clergy of property which they abused, were heretical, Huss desired an opportunity of speaking on this particular point with the emperor. He might be indulging the erroneous idea that he could come to an understanding with him on these points; that he could satisfy him that he was here defending the interest of the state against the claims of the hierarchy. The knights, says he, have only to represent to the emperor, that if this article should be condemned as heretical, he would be obliged to condemn the acts of his father, Charles IV., and his brother, Wenceslaus, who had taken away temporal goods from the bishops.[4] He wished that his writings in relation to these points might be communicated to the emperor, all that he had said concerning the dotation of Constantine, and on the argument to

1 Ibid. ep. 49.
2 Ibid. fol. 74, 2; ep. 53.
3 Ibid. fol. 73, 1; ep. 49.
4 Ibid. fol. 74, 2; ep. 54.

prove that tythes were nothing but alms;[1] and he was anxious also that the emperor should read his answers to the 45 articles of Wicklif.[2] He would be glad to have just a single interview with the emperor before he should be condemned; since he had come there by his will and under the promise of a safe-conduct,[3] glad if the emperor could be induced to show pity to his own birth-right, and not suffer it to be invaded with impunity by a malignant foe, (by which he may have meant Paletz or Michael de Causis). In another letter he expresses the same wish, that, in case he obtained a public hearing, the emperor would not suffer him to be remanded to prison, but allow him liberty to consult with his friends, and say something to the emperor, which might be of benefit to Christendom, and to the emperor himself.[4] But it must be evident that these hopes and wishes rested on a slender foundation, when we fairly consider the emperor's relation to the church. And Huss himself, too, sometimes perceived, no doubt, that after what had transpired he had nothing to expect from the emperor in relation to these matters; for he thus writes, in one of his letters, "I am surprised that the emperor has forgotten me, and that he does not speak a word for me; and, perhaps, I shall be condemned before I can have a word with him. Let him look to it himself whether this is to his honour." In the midst of his own trials, Huss was still tenderly alive to the interests of his friends. He besought the knight of Chlum to use his influence with the Bohemian knights to bring it about, that a citation to the adherents of Huss, which had been issued at the instigation of Paletz, should be revoked. He expressed the solicitude which he felt for his friends in Constance, particularly for the master of Reinstein; fearing that, by their too free language, they might bring themselves into difficulty. Reinstein should be cautious, he wrote to his friends: for those whom he considered to be his friends were more probably spies. He had heard it remarked by the commission, that John Cardinalis wanted to defame the pope and the cardinals, by insinuating that they were all guilty

1 See above, the document cited on this point.

2 Ibid. fol. 74, 1; ep. 51.

3 Sub sua promissione, ut salvus ad Bohemiam redirem; ibid. ep. 54, fol. 75, 1—a proof how far men were from supposing at that time that the emperor's instrument was a mere passport.

4 Ibid. fol. 73, 1; ep. 49.

of simony. It would be his advice that he should keep himself as closely as possible attached to the emperor's court, lest they might get possession of his person as they had done of himself.[1] To the knight of Chlum he wrote, entreating him not to be disheartened at the great expenses which he was obliged to incur at Constance. "If God delivers the goose from her confinement, rely upon it, that you shall never have cause to regret the expense you have been at."[2] In his confinement, Huss composed several small treatises of doctrine and ethics; either for immediate practical use, as the little tracts which he wrote at the request of his keepers for their special benefit, and that of others in like circumstances;[3] or, for the purpose of testifying his faith in opposition to prevailing suspicions: his short tracts on the Ten Commandments; on the Lord's Prayer; on mortal sin; on marriage; on the knowledge and love of God; on the seven mortal sins; on penance; on the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. In all his writings, Huss was accustomed to make great use of the church fathers, and displays extensive reading in that field. The writings just mentioned abound in this sort of learning, and yet he was totally in want of books. At first he had not even a Bible; and was obliged to ask his friends to procure him one.[4] He says, indeed, that he had brought with him the Sentences of the Lombard and a Bible; but he could not have taken them with him into his prison.[5] Yet his citations from these books are so minutely correct, that we can hardly suppose Huss depended wholly upon his memory. It is probable, therefore, that he always had by him a collection of ecxerpts, made in the time of his earlier studies. In his exposition of the Ten Commandments, we may notice as one thing serving to mark the peculiarity of his theological point of view, that he applied the command to keep holy the Sabbath-day, literally to Sunday. Worthy of notice, too, is his spiritual conception of holiness, which he represents as consisting in the perfect knowledge of the Triune God and of Christ as man, from which knowledge proceeds love; whence the saints

1 Ibid. fol. 75, 1; ep. 54.

2 Ibid. fol. 74, 1; ep. 51.

3 He requests the knight of Chlum to have his tracts de Mandatis, de corpore Christi, de Matrimonio, copied by Peter of Mladenowic.

4 Ibid. fol. 29, 2—44, 1.

5 Ibid. fol. 74; ep. 52 and 53.

love God supremely; and from love proceeds joy; and from knowledge, love, and joy, proceeds perfect satisfaction.[1] All the four principal mysteries of the Christian faith are set forth by him in his tract on the Lord's supper: the mystery of the trinity; the doctrine of divine foreknowledge and predestination,[2] (whence it is evident what importance was attached by Huss to the doctrine of absolute predestination); the doctrine of the incarnation of the divine Word; the doctrine of the body and blood of Christ in the holy supper. The devout remembrance of the sufferings of Christ constitutes, according to the view which he here expresses, the spiritual participation of the Lord's supper.[3] He declares it to be sufficient for the faith of the simple, to believe that the true body and the true blood of Christ are in the holy supper—the body in which he was born, in which he suffered, rose from the dead, and ascended to heaven. He expressly testifies here his belief in transubstantiation, which term he employs. He asserts that, from the beginning, he had taught in his sermons the transformation of the bread, and never the opposite. He compares the perversion of his language by his enemies with the perversion of Christ's words by the Pharisees. Only the crass expressions relating to certain sensuous affections to which the body of Christ was supposed to be subject in the Lord's supper, he rejects; declaring that all such affections related only to the species of the bread and wine,—where the doctrine *de accidentibus sine subjecto* evidently lay at bottom—that doctrine which as we have seen, Wicklif, from his own particular theological and philosophical position, condemned with peculiar abhorrence. It is to be remarked that Huss considers the passage in John vi. as also referring to the outward participation of the Lord's supper; on the ground of which interpretation the Hussites afterwards restored, as the ancient church had instituted, the communion of infants. Like Matthias of Janow, Huss, too, encouraged the frequent participation of the Lord's supper among the laity; and he found occasion to complain that even the rule prescribing the act of communion once a year was not observed; that many received the Lord's supper only at the last

1 Ibid. fol. 69, 2: ep. 37.

2 Et cognitionem, dilectionem et gaudium consequitur quietatio. Ibid. fol. 31, 1

3 Ibid fol. 38, 2.

extremity, and several not at all. He says of such: "How shall these people be ready to die for Christ, who have no pleasure in the food which is best for them, and which has been provided for them by infinite grace and love, to enable them to overcome all evil?"

Meantime, after Huss had left Prague, another controversy arose, by occasion of which the antagonism to the dominant church could not fail to be still more decidedly expressed. This controversy related to a point which Huss had never as yet made a subject of particular inquiry. After his own removal, the most important theologian of his party was his friend Jacob of Misa, or Mies, a parish priest attached to the church of St Michaels, commonly called, on account of his diminutive stature, Jacobellus. This person came out openly in opposition to the withholding of the cup from the laity; and insisted that, by the institution, the holy supper in both forms should be extended to the laity also. It was for a long time currently reported that a certain Peter, originally from Dresden, who had been driven, as an adherent to Waldensian doctrines, from his native country and come to Prague, was the original means of leading Jacobellus to introduce this point also among the matters requiring reform. This story is, in itself, extremely improbable. If we consider that, in the writings of Matthias of Janow, the necessity to the laity of a complete participation of the Lord's supper is assumed; and if we consider the great influence Matthias had on the whole movement, we shall find it impossible to believe that a man who might be a personal disciple of Matthias of Janow,[1] who at any rate must have been, in spirit and bent, one of his disciples, that such a man could need the influence of an unknown Waldensian to direct his attention to a subject which had already been deemed of so much importance by his own master. In contemporaneous writings not a word is to be found concerning this Peter of Dresden; in the controversial tracts on this subject no mention is made of him; and yet it would from the first have been hailed as a very welcome fact, by the defenders of the withdrawal of the cup, if they had the least reason

[1] As Palacky, p. 332 note—remarks, Jacobellus, a year before the death of Matthias of Janow, in the year 1393, was a Bachelor in Prague University.

whatever to trace the first attacks of this practice to the influence of a man who belonged to a sect so decried. This story is found for the first time in writings of opponents to the Hussite party some score of years later.[1] Whether such a person as Peter of Dresden ever existed or not, his history at all events lies altogether in the dark, and we have nothing to do with him here; but it does not admit of a question that the influence proceeded from Matthias of Janow by which Jacobellus was led, first in disputations, to come out openly, somewhere near the close of the year 1414, against the withholding of the cup. His arguments convinced many; and he began to reduce his theory to practice as a parish priest, and to distribute the holy supper once more, in both forms, to the laity. Among the adherents of Huss, a controversy arose on this point; for the more practical bent of his disposition had always kept him from entering into this question. His opinion was now requested. The principle on which he uniformly went, of deciding every question by the law of Christ as laid down in Holy Writ, would soon bring him to a decision of this question after his attention had once been directed to it, and also to a declaration of his views; nor did he hesitate to declare them openly, though he could not but foresee that, by so doing, he would probably injure his own cause.[2] Even before his imprisonment, Huss had composed a small tract on the question then in dispute; and from the collected declarations of the New Testament and of the ancient church teachers he came to the conclusion that, although both the body and blood of Christ were present under each form, yet, because Christ would not without special reasons have directed that each kind should be taken *separately*, it was permitted and would be profitable to the laity, to take the blood of Christ under the form of the wine.[3]

1 Thus it occurs in Aeneas Sylvius Hist. Bohemia, cap. 35, pag. 52.

2 So already, among the articles of complaint set forth by Michael de Causis, one was, that at Prague he had preached to the people that the Lord's Supper should be received in both the forms. The fact, indeed, brought forward to prove this, could prove nothing of the sort. It was that his disciples in Prague distributed the elements thus: Patet iste articulus, quia jam in Praga sui discipuli ministrant illud sub utraque specie. Hist. Hussi, opp. i. fol. 6, 1.

3 Licet et expedit laicis fidelibus sumere sanguinem Christi sub specie vini. Nam licet corpus et sanguis Christi sit sub utraque specie sacramentali, tamen Christus non sine ratione nec gratis instituit utrumque modum sacramentalem suis fidelibus, sed ad magnum profectum. De sanguine Christi, opp. i. fol. 43, 2.

Meantime, on the 21st of March, occurred that event of which we have already spoken, the flight of Pope John, the immediate instrument by whom Huss had been deprived of his liberty. This event led to an important change in the situation of the prisoner. Huss perceived from what transpired immediately about him, that something of this sort had occurred. He managed to get information of the movements produced by this event in the council. He ascribed them all to one cause, that men were attempting to effect an innovation in the kingdom of God by measures of human policy. "The council"—he writes—"is disturbed on account of the flight of the pope, as I believe. The reason is this: I have learned that, in whatever we undertake, God should ever be placed before human reason—a lesson which they have not learned."[1] The pope sent for all his officers and servants to meet him at Schaffhausen. In consequence of this, Huss was deserted by his keepers. No one was left to provide for his daily wants. He was deprived of the means of subsistence. He was in constant fear lest the marshal of the pope's court, who was intending to follow his master, would secretly take him away with himself. Late in the evening of Palm Sunday, March 24th, he communicated his fears to the knight of Chlum, and begged him, in conjunction with the Bohemian knights, to take measures to prevent this by requesting the emperor either to send him new keepers, or to set him at liberty, lest he might be to him the occasion both of sin and of shame.[2] The Bohemian knights, who, previous to these events, had never ceased pressing the emperor to set Huss at liberty, sought to take advantage also of the present juncture.[3] But the advocates of the hierarchical system exerted themselves to defeat this purpose;

1 Ratio, quia didici, quod omnibus in factis peragendis sive peractis debet praeponi deus humanae rationi. Ibid. fol. 75, 1; ep. 55.

2 Ne habeat et peccatum et confusionem de me. Ibid. ep. 56.

3 A letter written from Constance to one of the zealous followers of the dominant church—a portion of which has been cited from the manuscript by Palacky—shows that the hierarchical party did at the beginning undoubtedly fear that these circumstances might be taken advantage of to set Huss at liberty. The words are as follows: De Hus fuit periculum, ne eriperetur de carceribus ordinis Praedicatorum, situati ultra muros civitatis, quia custodes jam erant pauci et remissi; sed ex diligentia facta et clamore zelatorum fidei, ex decreto concilii, praesentatus est ad quoddam castrum et ad carceres domini episcopi Constantiensis. Palacky iii. 1, p. 339, note 448.

and after consultation with the council, the emperor delivered Huss over to the surveillance of the bishop of Constance, who at four o'clock the next morning had him removed, in chains, to the castle of Gottleben.[1] In the castle of Gottleben the situation of Huss was changed much for the worse. His prison was a tower. In the day time he was chained, yet so as to be able to move about; at night, on his bed, he was chained by the hand to a post. Here he no longer experienced that mild treatment from his keepers, which mitigated the severity of his former imprisonment. His friends were not allowed to visit him. New attacks of disease, violent headaches, hemorrhage, colic, followed in consequence of this severe confinement. Speaking of this in one of his later letters, he says: "These are punishments brought on me by my sins, and proofs of God's love to me."[2] In the midst of these severe trials he wrote, shortly before Easter, which in this year fell on the 31st of March, to his Bohemian friends at Constance: "May the God of mercy keep and confirm you in his grace and give you constancy in Constance;[3] for if we are constant we shall witness God's protection over us." "Now for the first time"—he writes—"I learn rightly to understand the Psalter, rightly to pray, and rightly to represent to myself the sufferings of Christ and of the martyrs. For Isaiah says (xxviii. 19), When brought into straits, we learn to hear —;[4] or, What does he know who has never struggled with temptation? Rejoice, all of you who are together in the Lord; greet one another, and seasonably prepare yourselves to partake worthily, before the passover, of the Lord's body; of which privilege, so far as it regards the sacramental participation, I am for the present deprived, and so shall continue to be as long as it is God's will. Nor ought I to wonder at this, when the apostles of Christ and many other saints, in prisons and deserts, have in like manner been deprived of the same. I am well, as I hope in Jesus Christ, and shall find myself still better after death, if I keep the

1 When Huss in the letter cited says the bishop of Constance wrote him, that he would have nothing to do with him, either this must have occurred before the agreement entered into with the emperor, or the bishop must have been seeking to conceal the purpose which he had in view.

2 Opp. i. fol. 69, 2; ep. 37.

3 A play on words: Det vobis constantiam in Constantia.

4 Ibid. fol. 73; ep. 50.

commandments of God to the end." Since the council no longer recognized as pope Balthazar Cossa, the committee nominated under his administration had no further authority to examine into the affair of Huss, and it was necessary to appoint a new one. This was done on the 6th of April, 1415, and the new commissioners were Cardinal d'Ailly, Cardinal St Marci, the bishop of Dola, and the abbot of the Cistercian order. Meantime the cause of Huss assumed a worse aspect on account of the distribution of the sacrament under both forms, which now commenced in Prague. This gave rise to the most injurious reports, and the whole blame had to fall upon Huss. The bishop John of Leitomysl had made great use of these rumours to confirm the prejudice against Huss, in his report to the council—had stated that the blood of Christ was carried about by the laity in flasks, and that they gave the communion to each other. Upon this, the Bohemian knights present at Constance handed in to the council on the 13th of May, a paper complaining in the most violent language that, contrary to all justice, and in violation of the emperor's word, Huss, without being heard, though he had ever declared himself ready to answer to the charge of heresy, had been harshly shut up in prison, where he was compelled to lie in fetters and supplied with the most wretched fare, where he had to suffer from hunger and thirst, and it was to be feared must in consequence of this harsh treatment, become disordered in mind. They complained, at the same time, of the calumnious charges set afloat against the Bohemians to the dishonour of their nation, alluding particularly to the statements made by bishop John of Leitomysl. The 16th of May was fixed upon as the time for acting on this matter; on which occasion bishop John of Leitomysl defended himself against this accusation and endeavoured to prove that he was right in proceeding as he had done against the propagators of the erroneous doctrines of Wicklif in Bohemia. The Bohemians did not suffer the remarks of the bishop to go unanswered, and once more urged it upon the council and the emperor that a free hearing should be granted to Huss. Finally they succeeded in obtaining the promise that Huss should be transferred to another prison in Constance, and that he should be allowed to speak for himself before the council on the 5th of June. The knight of

Chlum announced the decree of the council to his friend on the day it was passed, the 18th of May. "This is to inform you" —he wrote—"that the emperor with the deputies of all the nations of the council was this day assembled, that he spoke with them about your affairs, and in particular about granting you a hearing; and they at last declared themselves of one mind that you should obtain a public hearing; your friends moreover urged that you ought to be in a more pleasant situation, so as to be able to collect and refresh yourself." He then adds, with reference to the impending trial: "Therefore for God's sake, and for the sake of your own salvation, and for the advancement of the truth, may you never be led to swerve from that truth by any fear of losing this poor life. For it is only to promote your own true good that God has visited you with this trial." He then calls upon him, on account of the excitement which the controversy on the withdrawal of the cup had created in Bohemia, to express his opinion with regard to that matter on the same sheet, so that in due time what he had written might be shown to his friends in Bohemia. There was a difference among them on this point, and they had agreed to submit the whole to his decision. Huss replied: "As it regards collecting myself, I know not for what purpose I am to collect myself, nor what other condition of mind I should be in; for I know not to what end the hearing is to be granted me." Doubtless he had his misgivings whether he should obtain, after all, the free hearing which he demanded; such a hearing as would allow him to express his views before the council in a sermon, or to defend himself in the way of disputation, against the several charges,— liberties which he had applied for in a petition. It was only in such case that he could need, beforehand, any special collection of mind. "I hope"—says he—"by the grace of God, that I shall never swerve from the truth of which I have obtained the knowledge." The impending decision of his fate by the trial before the council, could not induce him to express himself otherwise than he had already done on the question respecting the withdrawal of the cup. He referred to the paper he had before drawn up, and added: "I know of nothing else to say, than that the gospels and the epistles of Paul speak decidedly for the distribution of the Lord's supper under both the forms, and that

it was so held in the primitive church. If it can be done, endeavour to bring it about, that the administration of the cup should be granted by a bull, at least to those who require it from motives of devotion, regard being had to circumstances."[1]

It was not until the beginning of the month of June, that Huss was liberated from his oppressive dungeon at Gottleben, where directly afterwards his place was taken by that Balthazar Cossa, who had first deprived him of his liberty. He was next conveyed to Constance, and a prison assigned to him in a Franciscan convent. Here the council assembled on the 5th of June to investigate his affair, and to hear the man himself, according as it had been promised him. Before Huss was produced, the proceedings were commenced by listening to the articles extracted by his adversaries from his writings; and they were upon the point of making a beginning *with the condemnation of these articles.* But Peter of Mladenowic, secretary to the knight of Chlum, a man enthusiastically devoted to Huss, hastened to give information of it to the knight his master, and to Wenceslaus of Duba. They speedily reported the case to the Emperor, who at once sent the Palgrave Louis and the Burgrave Frederic of Nuremberg to the council, directing them to tell the prelates, that before the appearance of Huss they should not take a step in his affair, and that they should in the first place lay all the erroneous articles which they found reason to charge against him before the emperor, who would take pains to have them carefully and minutely examined by pious and learned men. The two knights presented to the council the writings, from which the erroneous articles imputed to Huss were said to have been extracted, that the prelates might have it in their power to satisfy themselves whether those articles were really contained, as expressed in the charges, in his writings; requiring, however, that the same should be returned again into their hands, lest, perchance, it might be deemed right to destroy them as heretical. In fact, it was afterwards reported in many quarters that they were burned.[2] When Huss appeared before the council, these

1 Opp. i., fol. 72, 1; ep. 47 et 48.

2 So Huss himself praises his friends for having made this condition: Bene factum est, quod postulaverunt, ut eis liber meus restituceretur. Nam aliqui clamabant: Comburatur, et praesertim Michael de Causis, quem audivi. Ibid. fol. 69, 1; ep. 36.

writings were placed before him, and he was asked whether he acknowledged them to be his. He said yes; and declared himself ready to retract every expression in them in which it could be shown that he was in error. A single article was then read. Huss began to defend it, cited many passages from Scripture, and referred to the doctrine of the church; but they exclaimed that all this was nothing to the point. Whenever he began to speak he was interrupted, and not allowed to utter a syllable. A savage outcry rose against him on all sides. At length, when Huss saw that it was of no use, that he could not be heard, he determined to remain silent. This silence was now interpreted as a confession that he was convicted. Finally, it grew to be too bad; the moderate men in the assembly could stand it no longer, and as it was impossible to restore order, it was thought best to dissolve the assembly; the 7th of June having been fixed upon as the time when Huss should have his second hearing. On the 6th of June Huss wrote to his friends: "To-morrow, at noon, I am to answer; first, whether any one of the articles extracted from my writings is erroneous, and whether I will pledge myself to abjure it, and henceforth teach the contrary: secondly, whether I will confess that I have preached those articles which it shall be proved on good testimony that I have preached; thirdly, whether I will abjure these. May God in his mercy so order it, that the emperor may be present to hear the words that my gracious Saviour shall be pleased to put in my mouth." He wished to have the privilege of stating his answers in writing. Had this been allowed, he would have expressed himself thus: "I, John, servant of Christ, will not declare that any of the articles extracted from my writings are false, lest I condemn the declarations of holy teachers, and particularly of St Augustine. Secondly, I will not confess that I have asserted, preached, and believed the articles of which I am accused by false witnesses. Thirdly, I will not abjure, lest by so doing, I subject myself to the guilt of perjury."[1] On the 7th of June then, at one o'clock, Huss appeared for the second time before the council. On this occasion, the emperor Sigismund was present, as Huss had ever desired that he should be; and owing to the hearty sympathy they took in the cause of Huss, the proceedings were also

1 Ibid. fol. 65, 2; ep 27.

attended by the two above mentioned Bohemian knights, and Peter of Mladenowic. The first accusation, confirmed by many witnesses, was, that Huss denied the doctrine of transubstantiation. This he could declare with truth to be a false charge. Cardinal d'Ailly, however, who was a zealous nominalist, engaged in an argument to show that Huss ought, according to his principles, to deny that doctrine; for as he held to the objective reality of general conceptions,[1] and therefore also to the *paneitas a parte rei*, he could not suppose an annihilation of the same in any one case. But Huss would not allow that there was any force whatever in this reasoning, for he was of the opinion, that though the general conception might no longer be really present in a particular substance, still it did not cease on that account to retain its reality in itself, and to be actualized in other particular substances.[2] Out of this grew a violent dispute, in which several Englishmen took part, as zealous opponents of the doctrines of Wicklif. It was insinuated that the phraseology of Huss was suspicious. It was said that, like Wicklif, he was seeking to deceive by his language. Whatever he taught *must* be heresy. The same wild outcries commenced which had interrupted the first hearing. But the Emperor, who was present, commanded silence; and during the stillness which succeeded, Huss took the opportunity to exclaim with a loud voice so that all could hear: "I should have expected to find more sobriety, order, and decency prevailing in such an assembly." Said the president of the council, the cardinal archbishop John de Brogny of Ostia, addressing Huss, "At thy trial in the castle, thou showedst thyself more humble." Huss replied: "Neither was there *there* any such outcry."[3] Still one of the Englishmen had the justice

1 Huss himself explained this in the sense that general conceptions were the original forms, first created by God. Dixi de essentia communi creata, quae est primum esse creatum communicatum singulis creaturis. Ibid. fol. 62, 2; ep. 15.

2 His words: Desinit quidem esse in hoc singulari pane materiali, stante tali transsubstantiatione, cum ille tunc mutatur, vel transit in corpus Christi, vel transsubstantiatur, sed nihilominus in aliis singularibus subjectatur. Ibid. fol. 12, 2.

3 On comparing the Historia Hussi and the several statements in the letters of Huss, regarding his trials, there is some difficulty in determining whether this occurred on his first or his second hearing. For, we can hardly suppose that what Huss here says, and what the president of the council replies to him, occurred twice. But the account of the eye-witness in the Historia Hussi, who makes no mention of it at all, leaves no room for us to suppose, that the above declaration of Huss was made at the first hearing; for here it is said expressly that Huss at length remained

and good sense to declare, "that it was better to drop these wranglings about realism and nominalism, since they did not belong to the place, these disputes having nothing to do with the faith; and the word of Huss ought to be believed, when he said that he acknowledged transubstantiation."[1] Huss moreover perceived what had given occasion to the perversion of his language by his opponents regarding the doctrine of transubstantiation, when following the words of Christ he simply spoke of the fact, that Christ himself is the soul's true bread.[2] The dispute on the doctrine of transubstantiation having come to an end, Cardinal Francis Zabarella took up the word and said to Huss, "Thou knowest, master Huss, that by the mouth of two or three witnesses every word should be established; but now as thou seest thou hast against thee the testimony of twenty men or thereabouts, men who ought to be believed, and of the highest consideration, some of whom have themselves heard thee teach, while others testify to what they have heard and to the common report. And all furnish the strongest grounds of evidence for their statements. We must therefore believe them. I see not how thou canst still maintain thy cause against so many distinguished men." To this Huss replied: "But I call God

silent. And in the letter of Huss, (ep. 15; fol. 62, 2) where everything is exactly related, and in all probability immediately after the hearing, what is said of the dispute concerning the doctrine of transubstantiation, can have occurred, as is evident from comparing the Hist. H., only during the second hearing. But this is so nearly connected with the narrative of what Huss said, and what the president replied, that we cannot but regard it as a very arbitrary procedure, to separate the two remarks as to the time when they were made, and place one in the first, and the other in the second hearing, as has been done by V. d. Hardt, (iv., pag. 307). It is singular that the same thing should be done also by Palacky, who is generally so exact, unless he found reason for so doing in the original record of Mladenowic, and in the Bohemian original text of the letters of Huss, which we can know nothing about. To be sure, Huss in his letter in Mikowec's collection, (p. 22), remarks that this took place at the first hearing. But we must necessarily correct this statement, to avoid a contradiction which would otherwise occur in the letters of Huss himself, by the earlier and more exact account; for this last letter was written on the 26th of June.

1 The words of the Englishman are: Quorsum haec de universalibus disputatio, quae ad fidem nihil facit? Ipsi, quantum audio, recte sentit de sacramento altaris. Opp. i., fol, 12, 2.

2 Huss himself says at his trial: Caeterum hoc se fateri, cum archiepiscopus Pragensis omnino prohibuisset uti illo termino panis, tunc se hoc edictum episcopi non potuisse probare, quia Christus ipse in vi., cap. Joann. undecies se nominaverit panem angelorum, qui de coelo descendisset, ut toti mundo vitam daret, sed de pane materiali se nunquam dixisse. Ibid.

and my conscience to witness that I have not so taught, and that it never entered my mind so to teach as these persons have the hardihood to say that I have, testifying against me what they never heard. Were there a great many more still, I esteem the testimony of my God and of my conscience higher than the judgments of all my adversaries, about which I do not trouble myself." The cardinal answered :[1] "We cannot judge by thy conscience, but must be content with the very firm and confident testimony of these men. For not from any hatred or enmity to thee, as thou affirmest, do they offer this testimony, but they give such reasons as betray no sign of hatred, and leave us no room to doubt."[2] So strongly biassed is the cardinal, that he cannot or will not see the trace of a spiteful distortion of the words of Huss, even in Paletz, but believes that Huss wrongs him altogether, and that if Paletz had altered the words of Huss, he had altered them into a still milder sense than they had in their original connection. Besides, he felt particularly annoyed that Huss should presume to cast suspicion on Chancellor Gerson, than whom a more excellent man was not to be found in all Christendom. The next accusation was that Huss had obstinately defended the heretical doctrines of Wicklif. Huss replied, that he had taught neither the errors of Wicklif, nor those of any other man. If Wicklif had taught errors in England, this was the concern of the English. But his resistance to the condemnation of the forty-five articles of Wicklif was adduced in proof of the charge that he defended his doctrines, to which he replied: The *form* in which those articles were all unconditionally condemned was one to which his conscience would not permit him to assent; but in particular he could not consent to the condemnation of the article that Constantine had erred in making that dotation, and Sylvester in accepting it. The article and also the proposition, of which we have spoken on a former page, that a priest chargeable with mortal sin, could not baptize nor consecrate the Lord's supper, he modified by saying that such an one

1 [According to the marginal note in the Historia Joann. Huss. fol. 13, 1, and perhaps also according to the words themselves, the cardinal here, and in what follows, is not Zabarella the Cardinalis Florentinus, but Peter d'Ailly the Cardinalis Cameracensis.]

2 Ibid. fol. 13, 1.

did it in an unworthy manner, and was but an unworthy minister of the sacraments; and in spite of all the contradictions of his opponents, he asserted that in no other sense was the article to be found in his writings; and he proved this against Paletz to ocular inspection by comparing the propositions ascribed to him with his book which was produced. Furthermore he frankly acknowledged that he had not dared to agree in condemning the article which affirmed that tythes were to considered as alms. Cardinal Zabarella now argued to refute him. He said that "it belonged to the nature of an alms that it should be given voluntarily, and not by obligation; but the paying of tythes was founded on an obligation. Zabarella went on the principles of ecclesiastical law; but Huss proceeded only on ethical principles; hence he could not admit the premises in Zarabella's argument, for he maintained that alms-giving too was a matter of moral obligation. Men were bound, on pain of damnation, to observe those six works of mercy which Christ mentions in Matt. xxv. 35, 36; and yet these are alms. It was a part of the scholastic sophistry of those times, for parties to engage in dispute without taking any pains first to settle with each other the different meaning of terms. Next an English archbishop displayed the subtlety of his logic by the following argument against Huss: From this it would follow that the poor, who cannot give alms for want of means, must be damned. Huss replied: That he spoke only of those that had the means. And he went on to assert that the tenths had, in the beginning, been an entirely voluntarily thing; and were not made obligatory until a long time afterwards. This he proposed to show more at large, but was not permitted. Huss then said that, in general, all he had ever demanded was, that proofs should be drawn from holy Scripture to justify the condemnation of the propositions of Wicklif which were to be condemned. He entered into a full, calm, and sober account of the whole course of the disputes on the writings of Wicklif and of his own personal concern in the matter,[1] until the time of his appeal to Christ. The question was then put to him whether the pope, then, had given him leave to break away from his own jurisdiction and appeal to

1 Which account we have already availed ourselves of in the preceding narrative.

another tribunal;[1] and whether it was permitted to appeal to Christ? To this Huss replied: "This I openly maintain before you all, that there is not a more just nor a more effectual appeal than the appeal to Christ; for to appeal means, according to law, nothing but this: in a case of oppression, from an inferior judge to invoke the aid of a higher one. And now what higher judge is there than Christ? Who can get at the truth of a cause in a more righteous and truthful manner than he? for he cannot be deceived, neither can he err? Who can more easily afford help to the poor and oppressed?" But this was language which the council could not understand; and it was received with laughter and scorn. Furthermore, it was charged against him, that to introduce his heresies among the unlearned and simple, he had given an exagge rated account of the doings at that notorious earthquake-council,[2] and represented it as a judgment of God in favour of Wicklif;[3] that he had said, as we have observed on a former page, he wished his soul to be where Wicklif's soul was. In reply to the first, Huss said nothing, and it may perhaps have been true; nor would it be anything strange that one so favourably inclined to Wicklif and so biassed against his opponents should hold such a story to be true, and look upon the whole thing as a judgment of God. With regard to the second, Huss said[4] he did not deny that, twelve years before the *theological* writings of Wicklif were known in Bohemia, he had made himself familiar with some of that writer's philosophical writings which greatly pleased him; and as he had been informed on good authority of the upright-

1 The words: Habueritne absolutionem? These words may indeed also mean: Has been absolved by the pope? Yet the connection is in favour of the interpretation which I have given in the text; so that the question relates to an ἀπολύτικον on the part of the pope, or of the so-called apostoli; and this besides is altogether characteristic of the *positive* spirit of his judges.

2 See above, page 220.

3 Illico ostium ecclesiae fulmine ruptum est, ita ut adversarii Wicleff aegre sine incommodo evaserint. Opp. i., fol. 14, 1. As such facts, especially in the contests between parties, are very apt to be represented in an exaggerated manner in tradition according to the passions of the particular individuals, so it is quite possible that the story in the present case was somewhat exaggerated as it was told among the Wicklifites.

4 We have already on a former page found it probable, that Huss had first been led to think favourably of Wicklif by his intimacy with the philosophical writings of the latter relating to the general controversy between the realists and nominalists. But in respect to the exact number of years Huss might easily be mistaken at such a trial.

ness of Wicklif's life, so he had let fall the words: "I hope John Wicklif is in heaven. But although I did entertain the fear that he might be damned, yet I could still express the hope that my soul might be where the soul of Wicklif was." Again these words of Huss, uttered with his peculiar conscientiousness, and in entire consistency with his views of the doctrines of absolute predestination and subjective justification, were received with derision. It was objected to him, again, that he had invited the people, by the posting up of public notices, to resort to the sword against their adversaries. But he could appeal to it as a fact, that he had spoken in his sermons only of spiritual weapons; and, aware of the disposition among some to pervert his words, had taken special pains to point out that he was not speaking of a fleshly but of the spiritual sword. He was, moreover, accused of having fomented schism in Bohemia between the spiritual and the secular power, and caused the expulsion of the Germans from the University of Prague. He vindicated himself from this charge, by giving the true account of the whole course of the affair, as we have stated it on a former page. Paletz alleged against Huss, that not only Germans but Bohemians were banished. But Huss could prove that this had occurred during his absence. For as we have seen before, he certainly was not present at Prague when those men of the theological faculty were banished. One thing characteristic of these disputes was the pains taken to raise suspicions against the sayings and doctrines of Huss in a political point of view, and thus to excite against him the prejudices of the ruling powers. So we may interpret d'Ailly, when, speaking loud enough to be heard by the emperor, he said to Huss: "When you were first brought before us, I heard you say[1] that if you had not proposed of your own accord to come to Constance, neither the emperor nor the king of Bohemia could have compelled you to come." Thereupon Huss said his language had been this: "If he had not been disposed to come there of his own accord, so many of the knights in Bohemia were his friends that he might easily have remained at home in some safe place of concealment, so that he never could have been forced to come there by the will of those

1 Which may have probably occurred when Huss first appeared before the pope and the cardinals.

two princes." At this, Cardinal d'Ailly exclaimed, in an angry tone: "Mark the impudence of the man!" And a murmur of disapprobation arising, the noble knight of Chlum spoke out in confirmation of what Huss had said: "Compared with other knights"—said he—"I have but little power in Bohemia; yet I could protect him, for a whole year, against all the power of these two sovereigns. How much more could be done by others, who are more powerful than I, and hold the stronger castles?" After these words of the knight, d'Ailly was not disposed to go any farther into this matter, but said to Huss: "I advise you to submit, according to your promise while in prison,[1] to the sentence of the council. By so doing you will provide best both for your welfare and your honour." Taking up the remark of d'Ailly, the emperor said: Though it was reported that Huss had not received his safe-conduct from the emperor till fourteen days after his imprisonment,[2] the emperor could prove, by the testimony of many princes and persons of rank, that he had received the safe-conduct before leaving Prague, from the hands of the knights Wenceslaus of Duba and John of Chlum,[3] and full liberty was secured to him of defending himself and giving an account of his faith before the council; and this promise had been well fulfilled by the prelates, for which the emperor had all reason to thank them; although many said the emperor did wrong in granting protection to a man who was a heretic, or suspected of heresy. The emperor, therefore, would now give Huss the same advice with Cardinal d'Ailly. Let him defend nothing obstinately; but with regard to all that was brought against him and had been confirmed by credible witnesses, let him submit, with becoming obedience, to the authority of the council. If he did this, the emperor would see to it that, for his own sake, and for the sake of his brother Wenceslaus and of the whole Bohemian empire, he should be dealt with by the council in a lenient manner, and let off with a slight penance and satis-

1 Without doubt in reference to that conditionally understood submission; the implied condition, however, being ignored.

2 It appears, accordingly, that many sought to excuse the imprisonment of Huss by asserting that his safe-conduct did not arrive till after that had taken place.

3 Which, to be sure, is at variance with the statement of Huss himself (see above), that he set out on his journey *without* a safe-conduct.

faction; if not, the leaders of the council would know what they had to do with him; the emperor would never undertake to protect his errors; he would sooner prepare the faggots for him with this his own hands than suffer him to go on any longer with the same obstinacy as before. To this Huss replied: "In the first place I thank your majesty for the safe-conduct." And as he was now invited and charged by the knight of Chlum to defend himself against the reproach of obstinacy, which had been cast upon him, he said: "I call God himself to witness that it never entered my thoughts to defend anything obstinately, and that I came here voluntarily and of my own accord with the purpose of changing my opinion without any hesitation, if I should be taught better." Huss was then placed under the care of the bishop of Riga and conducted back to his prison. The same day Huss wrote to his friends in Constance, respecting this examination: "The Almighty God gave me to-day a strong and courageous heart. Two of the articles of complaint against me have been abandoned. I now hope, by the grace of God, that several others besides will be abandoned. They cry out, nearly all of them, like the Jews against our Master Christ." He says that, among the whole multitude of the clergy he had not a single friend except one Pole whom he knew, and the father. By the father is probably meant that remarkable secret friend of Huss, who subsequently was so active in endeavouring to bring about a compromise between him and the council, and of whom we shall have occasion to say more hereafter. "O"—he wrote—"if a hearing were granted me, in which I could reply to such arguments as they might bring against the articles contained in my treatises; then, believe I, would many of those who cry out, be compelled to be dumb. As God in heaven wills, so let it be."[1] Again Huss wrote: Let all the Bohemian knights apply to the emperor and council and demand that as the emperor and council had promised, he might in the next audience briefly state what he had to retract, at the same time giving his explanations.[2] Thus the emperor and council would fulfil this promise

1 Opp. i. fol. 69, 2; ep. 36.

2 We should from these words of Huss complete, therefore, the account of what occurred in this second hearing, and seems to have been left out in the report of Mladenowic.

too, as they might be forced to do, if held to their own words. "I will then speak out"—he writes—"the truth without reserve; for rather would I be consumed by the faggots, than kept so miserably concealed by them; for then all Christendom would learn what I finally said." To Chlum, whom he called his most trusty patron, he wrote: "May God be your rewarder. I desire that you would not leave the council till you have seen the end." "O"—says he—"much would I prefer that you should see me led to the stake, than that I should be so treacherously kept in the dark. I still have hopes that Almighty God, through the merit of the saints, may deliver me out of their hands." He begged his friends to let him know when, on the next morning, he should be led forth to trial. He desired them all to pray for him that if he must await death in prison, he might be endued with patience. He lamented that he had not been able to repay many of them for their services, and sent to request that they would be content, and excuse him on the ground of his want of ability. He knew not who was to repay those who had lent him money in Bohemia, unless it were the Master Christ, on whose account they had lent it to him. Still he expresses the wish that some of the more wealthy would settle up his affairs and pay his poorer creditors.

On the 8th of June, Huss was conducted to his third examination. The articles of charge were read over in their regular order, together with the answers which he had given to them at his private examinations in prison. They were more particularly articles said to have been extracted from his book *De Ecclesia*. With regard to some of them Huss acknowledged that the assertions imputed to him were his, and added a few words, either to establish them, or to guard them against misapprehension; but with regard to the majority of them, he did nothing of the sort, being confident of proving either that they were not contained in his writings, or that they were altered by being rent from their connection or purposely misconstrued. We may notice in particular the fifth article, relative to his doctrine concerning the church, which we have already explained, and which stood closely connected with his doctrine of predestination. He was reported to say, that dignity, choice of man, visible signs, made no one a member of the church. Huss while in prison had

acknowledged this assertion to be one contained in his book; and in confirmation of its truth had added: All depends here on defining what is meant by being in the church and a member of the church; and this depends on predestination. Predestination was the divine counsel, whereby grace was prepared for men in this life, and glory in the future life. Distinctions of rank, human choice, visible signs, did nothing of this kind. Judas Iscariot, notwithstanding he was chosen by Christ, notwithstanding the temporal gifts of grace which he received, and notwithstanding the opinion which the multitude had of him, was no true disciple of Christ, but a wolf in sheep's clothing. His assertion that no "*praescitus*" was a member of the church, he proved by many authorities from Bernard and Augustin. Furthermore, the tenth article: "If he who is called the vicar of Christ copies after his life, he is his vicar; but, if he takes the opposite course, he is a messenger of antichrist, stands in contradiction with Peter and Christ, and is a vicar of Judas Iscariot." Huss confirmed this proposition, citing it as it really stood in his books, and in confirming it, referred to a passage from Bernard's work De Consideratione. When this was read, the prelates looked at each other, shook their heads, and laughed. The twelfth article was: that the papal dignity took its origin from the Roman emperors. Huss added in confirmation of this, that the Emperor Constantine conferred this dignity on the bishop of Rome, and it was afterwards confirmed by the other emperors; that, as the emperor was the first among princes, the pope was the first among bishops, in reference, namely, to earthly honour and earthly goods. Yet the papal dignity had its origin directly from Christ, so far as it regarded the *spiritual* dignity, and the call to the spiritual guidance of the church. Cardinal d'Ailly, in opposing this, appealed to the sixth canon of the council of Nice, according to the common interpretation; and asked Huss why he had not derived this rather from the decree of the council than from the emperor? But Huss stood firm to his assertion, that the dignity was first derived from the gift of Constantine. The 22d article related to the important principle, important in reference to ethics laid down by Augustin in opposition to Pelagianism, that in moral judgments everything depends on the intention, the *intentio oculis animi;* hence the opposition

generally between the godlike and the ungodlike life:—the state of grace where everything is determined by the same fundamental relation to the temper; the general bent of the life is one well-pleasing to God; every natural affection is ennobled, and the man, whether he eat or drink, does everything to the glory of God; or the opposite temper of alienation from God,—the ground-tone of the life is either love or selfishness. Now, while Huss had, with Augustin and Jovinian, given prominence to the unmeditated antithesis alone, as grounded in the idea or the principle, d'Ailly, on the other hand, held to the empirical view, and considered the Christian as he actually appears, with the sinful element still cleaving to him; and in opposition to Huss he remarked: "Yet holy Scripture says we all sin;" and adverting to the words, 1 John i. 8, he said: "So then it would follow from this, that we sin *continually*." To this Huss replied: "Holy Scripture speaks, in such places, of remissible sins, which the moral temper at bottom does not quite exclude from the man,[1] but which may perhaps exist along with it." The article was read of which we have already spoken on a former page, that whenever a king, pope, bishop, lay under a mortal sin, he was neither king,[2] pope, nor bishop. Huss had, in his answer, explained this as meaning that such a person was not so in a *worthy* manner, in the sight of God. But in so doing, he had expressly taken care not to deny the objective validity of any sacramental act performed by such a prelate; such a person was only an *unworthy* minister of the sacraments, through whom Christ *himself* baptized and consecrated. At the time this was read, the emperor stood by a window, and by him the Palgrave Louis and the Burgrave Frederic of Nuremberg; and, after much conversation about Huss, he said: "There never was a more mischievous heretic." On these words being read, which torn from their connection might be interpreted as tending to the overthrow of all civil power and order, the emperor's attention was called to them, and he caused them to be repeated. And this too doubtless made an impression on the emperor. He said: "Yet no man living is without sin." But Cardinal d'Ailly exclaimed indignantly to Huss: "Did it not satisfy thee that thou

[1] Quae non expellunt habitum virtutis ab homine. Fol. 18, 1.

[2] In reference to this he appeals to 1 Sam. xv. 11.

soughtest by thy writings and discourses to bring into contempt and to overthrow the spiritual order: wilt thou now seek also to push kings from their thrones?" Then a disputation arose between Paletz and Huss, turning on this: that in the explication of conceptions objective and subjective, worthiness conditioned on moral qualities, and lawfully-existing orders independent of these qualities, were not duly distinguished; for which Huss had really given occasion enough in the way in which he had stated the distinction. If Huss, instead of merely holding fast to what he had paradoxically expressed, had in his answer explained the matter with more clearness and precision, he would thereby have guarded against many a falsely reasoned conclusion, which proved injurious to his cause. Paletz, for example, observed with regard to a case cited by Huss, that Saul was nevertheless king, though he had heard those words of Samuel; and David too had prevented the slaying of Saul, not on account of the holiness of Saul's life, a quality in which he was utterly deficient, but on account of the holiness that proceeded from his anointing. And when Huss cited a passage from Cyprian to the effect that he was falsely called a Christian who did not follow Christ in his daily walk, Paletz replied: "Mark the simplicity of the man, who quotes what has nothing to do with the subject. For suppose one not to be truly a Christian; is he therefore not truly a pope, bishop, or king? for these latter are names of office, but the term Christian is a designation of character. And accordingly one may be truly a pope, bishop, or king, without being a true Christian." Thereupon Huss answered; "Then if John was a true pope, why have you deposed him from his office?" Here the emperor struck in: "The council has lately declared that John was a true pope; but on account of the crimes by which he soiled the papal dignity, and on account of his squandering away the property of the church, they have deposed him." A passage being now cited which was pointed directly against the lawfulness of the condemnation of the forty-five propositions of Wicklif, Cardinal d'Ailly exclaimed: "But thou hast said thou wouldst not defend any of the propositions of Wicklif; yet it now appears from thy writings thou hast openly defended his propositions." Huss replied: "I say the same that I said before, that I will defend the errors neither of Wicklif nor of any other man,

But because it seemed contrary to my conscience to consent unconditionally to their condemnation, where no reason was produced for it from Scripture, I was unwilling to join in condemning them; and because the different qualifications introduced would not suit all the different propositions." When the article was read which denied the necessity of a visible head to the church, where the words occurred that Christ would guide the church better without such monsters of supreme heads, by means of his true disciples scattered through all the world, the prelates said: "Mark, he now puts on the prophet!" In confirmation of what he had said, Huss now added: "Yes, I say it, that the church under the apostles was infinitely better governed than it is at the present time. And what hinders that Christ should not better govern by his *true* disciples, without such monsters of supreme heads as they now are? And mark, we have no such supreme head at present, and yet Christ does not cease to govern his church." This remark also excited a laugh. Again, among the articles was one in which, in certain cases, the right was conceded to laymen of passing judgment on the acts of prelates. Next came the article which accused Huss of having said that he was going to Constance; and if for any cause whatever he should recant anything he had previously taught, he thought he never could do it from honest conviction, because all he had taught was in conformity with the true and sound doctrine of Christ. Huss could only declare that all this was pure fabrication; and doubtless he intimated that a letter which he had written to his community at Prague, probably gave occasion to the calumny.[1] Among the articles now brought forward against Huss, were to be found those also which originated with Chancellor Gerson, and which had already been laid before Huss in prison. To Gerson, Huss could not appear otherwise than as a heretic, since he refused to acknowledge the immutable and divine right of the hierarchy, and since to him he seemed to invite the people to rebellion against the church. He had already, in the year 1414, called upon Conrad of Vechta to see to it that the heresies of Huss should be punished by the secular power, on these points. He was still wholly entangled in the old ecclesiastical law. The

[1] Thus he complains above, that this letter had fallen into the hands of his enemies, and that many statements in it had been falsified and distorted.

civil magistracy seemed to him called and bound to punish heretics like other transgressors, and so render them harmless. "Miracles"—so Gerson thought—"ought not to be required for the confirmation of the ancient church doctrines; the authority of councils, the utterances of all the church teachers, were sufficient. To these common authorities every individual should submit his private judgment. He who hears not this voice, would not hear though one should rise from the dead." So he interprets Christ's words in the parable of Lazarus. "It only remains, then"—he proceeds—"to employ the secular sword against those who will not hear the voice of the church."[1] Gerson's articles against Huss related to the notion of the church, the definition of it as the community of the elect, the denial of the necessity of a visible head, the way in which Huss seemed to have made the dignity of the pope, the king, etc., depend on the subjective worth of the individual. In what sense Huss intended this to be understood, Gerson does not stop to inquire. Such propositions, without further explanation, were easily liable, as we have seen, to be interpreted as countenancing revolution; for example, the proposition that no *praescitus* belonged to the church, no man who did not follow the life of Christ; that whoever led a good life, after the pattern of Christ, should publicly teach and preach, even though not empowered so to do by his ecclesiastical superiors; nay, even though he were prohibited by them, or though they pronounced him under the ban; just as he could and must give alms; because that calling which is founded on a good life and knowledge was sufficient. In reference to the assertion that no *praescitus* was a true pope, bishop, king, etc., Gerson remarked: "To maintain such an error is madness; it is insurrectionary, leading to the overthrow of every civil constitution; because no one knows whether he belongs to the number of the elect or the reprobate (a doctrine in which, as we have seen, Huss agreed with Gerson), and because we all offend in many parts of our duty. All government would be an unsettled, uncertain thing, were it made to depend on the fact that he who exercised it belonged among the elect and had attained to the position of Christian love. And Peter must have been wrong in

[1] Extracts from the letter of Gerson, in Du Boulay Hist. Univ. Paris v. 269.

enjoining it on servants to be obedient even to bad masters. The University of Paris, in their declaration drawn up by Gerson, where they invite the council to the extirpation of mischievous errors, added: "Though in these propositions, we may recognize a certain zeal against the vices of the clergy, which to our sorrow we must confess have gotten too much the upper hand, yet it is not a zeal joined with knowledge. A prudent zeal tolerates while it sighs over the sins which it observes in the house of God but cannot destroy. The evil spirits, however, will not be driven out by Beelzebub, but only by the finger of God, which is the Holy Ghost." The want of Christian prudence is objected to Huss.[1] When now all the charges had been brought forward, Cardinal d'Ailly said to Huss: "Thou hast heard how many and what abominable charges are brought against thee. Therefore it is thy duty to consider what thou intendest to do. Two ways are proposed to thee by the council, of which thou must needs choose one. First, that thou shouldest submit thyself suppliantly to the judgment of the council, and bear without murmuring whatever it may please to ordain. If that is done, we shall, out of regard to the two sovereigns and from our desire for thy welfare, proceed against thee with all gentleness and humanity. But if thou still proposest to defend some of the articles which have now been laid before us, and demandest to be heard still further, we shall not deny thee this privilege. But thou must bear in mind that there are here men of so much weight and so much knowledge, that have so well settled and

1 The pain and indignation manifested by Huss at these particular articles of Gerson, which were laid before him while in prison, are well worthy of remark. It may, perhaps, be accounted for from the fact, that he was conscious of being so very far from intending any of those practically mischievous consequences which Gerson deduced from his doctrines, and yet must see that there might be some reason for apprehending them in the form in which he had expressed these propositions. Hence may have arisen in him the wish to have an opportunity of replying to Gerson in writing, so as to present his doctrines in their true sense, to confirm them by their agreement with Augustin, and to guard them against being so understood as to lead to the consequences which had been drawn from them. In the letter already quoted, written before Easter, he remarks in reference to the articles of complaint brought against him by Gerson: O that God would grant me time to write against the falsehoods of the Parisian chancellor, who was not afraid to accuse his neighbour of error so insolently and so unjustly before so vast a multitude. But, perhaps, God will interrupt the writing by his death or my own, and better decide the cause before his tribunal than I could do by any writings of mine. Opp. fol. 73, 2; ep. 50. Compare also the passages quoted on preceding pages.

strong reasons against thy articles, that I fear it will redound to thy great injury, to thy great danger, if thou undertakest to defend them yet longer. I speak this in the way of exhortation, and not as thy judge." Others, taking up these words of d'Ailly, exhorted Huss, each after his own fashion. He answered with a profound expression of humility: "Reverend fathers! I have already often said that I came here voluntarily, not for the purpose of defending anything obstinately, but of cheerfully submitting to be taught better if in anything I have erred. I beg, therefore, that opportunity may be allowed me to explain my opinions further. And if I do not adduce good and true reasons for them, then I will gladly, as you require, submit to be instructed by you." Here some one said aloud: "Mark, how cunningly he speaks! He says 'instructed,' not 'corrected,' not 'decided.'" "Nay, as you please"—rejoined Huss—"let it be instruction, correction, or decision; for I call God to witness, that I speak nothing but from the heart." Then, said d'Ailly, taking Huss at his word, yet overlooking the condition which was ever present to his mind: "Since thou dost submit thyself to the instruction and mercy of the council, know that this has been resolved upon by near sixty doctors, of whom some have already gone away, whose places have been taken by the Parisians; and it has been confirmed unanimously by the council: First, that thou humbly declarest that thou didst err in those articles that have been produced against thee; next, that thou promisest, on thy oath, neither to hold nor to teach such opinions any longer; thirdly, that thou dost publicly recant all those articles." When many had spoken much to the same purport, Huss finally said: "I repeat, that I am ready to be instructed by the council; but I beseech and conjure you by him who is the God of us all, that you do not force me to what I cannot do without contradicting my conscience, and without danger of eternal damnation, that you do not force me to renounce, upon my oath, all the articles which have been brought against me. For I know that to abjure means to renounce a previously cherished error. As now many articles have been imputed to me, which to hold or to teach never entered my thoughts, how can I renounce them by an oath? But as regards those articles which really belong to me, I will cheerfully do

what you require, if any one can persuade me to another opinion." Upon this, the emperor said: "Why mayest thou not, with good conscience, renounce all that has been charged upon thee by false witnesses? *I* do not hesitate to abjure all possible errors; yet from this it by no means follows that I have ever *taught* such errors." Huss replied: "Most gracious emperor! the word *abjure* means something different from that which your majesty expresses by it." And Cardinal Zabarella here remarked: "There will be handed thee a tolerably mild form of abjuration; and then thou canst easily make up thy mind, whether thou wilt make it or not." We shall be able, perhaps, hereafter to find some clue to the form of recantation which the cardinal had in mind; and this will lead us to divine a remarkable secret connection in the train of events. The emperor then spoke again, repeating the language of d'Ailly: "Thou hast heard that two ways are proposed to thee,—first, that thou shouldest publicly renounce those doctrines which have now been publicly condemned, and submit thyself to the judgment of the council; which if thou doest, thou wilt experience the mercy of the council. But if thou dost persist in defending thy opinions, the council will no doubt understand how to deal with thee according to the laws." Huss now said to the emperor: "Most gracious emperor, I make no resistance to anything the council may decide with regard to me. I except but one thing—doing wrong to God and to my own conscience, and saying that I have taught errors which never entered into my thoughts. But I entreat that liberty may be granted me from you to explain my opinions still farther, so as to give a sufficient answer to some things objected to me; namely, concerning the offices of the church." But the same that had already been said was repeated by others and by the emperor. "Thou art old enough"—said the emperor—"and canst not fail to understand what I said to thee yesterday and to-day. We cannot do otherwise than believe trustworthy witnesses. If, according to Scripture, by two or three witnesses every word shall be established, how much more shall this hold good where the witnesses are so many and so great men. If then thou art reasonable, thou wilt accept with contrite heart the penance appointed thee by the council, and renounce manifest errors, and promise on thy oath never to hold

forth the like for the future; if not, there are laws according to which thou wilt be judged by the council." One of the prelates now spoke and said, We ought not to believe even the recantation of Huss, since he had written that though he recanted he would reserve his private conviction.[1] Huss stood firmly to his earlier declaration. Paletz was for showing that Huss contradicted himself, in protesting that he defended no error, and no error of Wicklif, while, however, in his discourses and writings he defended errors of Wicklif; if he denied this, such writings of his could be laid before the council. The same was said by the emperor; and to this Huss replied: "Gladly would I have it done; and could wish that not these merely, but other books of mine might be laid before the council." Several other charges connected with the Hussite movements in Prague were then laid against Huss. We will repeat none of these, as we have already spoken of the same matters in narrating the events themselves. One thing only needs to be mentioned, as serving to give us a clearer insight into the character of the proceedings against Huss, to show how no means were left untried to procure his condemnation, and what presence of mind, what power of faith the man must have possessed; what resolution, what summoning of every energy was required on his part when, after having suffered so long and so severe an imprisonment, where he had passed through so much sickness and experienced so much that must have grieved and depressed his spirit, and after having been kept awake through the whole preceding night by toothache, he was compelled, in that long trial, to reply to such an unimaginable variety of attacks and surmises from so many different quarters. At this time, after all the charges had been brought against Huss, Paletz had the effrontery to step forward and say: "I call God to witness, in presence of the emperor and of all the prelates here assembled, that in these complaints against Huss I have been actuated by no hatred, no ill-will towards him; I have only felt bound to the due discharge of my doctor's oath." The same said Michael de Causis. Hereupon Huss declared: "But I commend all this to our Father in heaven, who will righteously

1 See what Huss says in the letter already quoted concerning this perversion of his language.

judge the cause of both parties." And Cardinal d'Ailly was biassed enough by the interests of the church party to express, as he had before done, his admiration of the mildness of Paletz, who he said might have sighted things a great deal worse than he had done from the writings of Huss. But when Huss, worn down and completely exhausted, was led back to his prison, the noble-hearted knight of Chlum hastened to visit him, under the full influence of the impression made by his appearance and defence of himself, and seizing his hand, pressed it in a way which must have told more than words. Huss himself describes the effect which this testimony of friendship made at such a time produced on his mind: "O, what joy did I feel"—he writes—"from the pressure of my lord John's hand, which he was not ashamed to give me, the wretched outcast heretic, in my chains."[1]

As regards the further proceedings of the council in thisaffair of Huss, it remains for us to say, that the emperor, after the defendant had been removed, made a proposition to the council, declaring to them, that Huss, as had been clearly proved by many witnesses, had taught so many pernicious heresies, that he deserved, in his judgment, and for some of them singly, to perish at the stake; but though he should recant, he never should be allowed to preach or to teach again, nor permitted to return to Bohemia; for, owing to the great number of his adherents in that country, it would be easy for him to excite anew still more violent commotions, and the evil would only grow worse. The emperor, furthermore, advised that those doctrines of Huss, on which the council had pronounced sentence of condemnation, should be made known throughout Bohemia, Poland, and other countries, where those heresies had found admittance; and that the spiritual and secular powers in those lands should be called upon to co-operate in bringing to punishment those who taught such doctrines. Severe measures, also, should be taken against the adherents to the Hussite doctrines, who were to be found in Constance. As we have already said, several persons in the council, seizing upon those words of Huss, in which he humbly professed himself ready to be instructed and to recant, without

[1] Opp. i., fol. 68, 2; ep. 33.

taking them in his own sense with the condition which he presupposed, were led to entertain the hope, that Huss might yet be persuaded to recant; and for this reason the final decision of his fate was put off, and several attempts were made to persuade him to recantation. But even in this case it was thought not advisable, and the emperor himself had expressed the same opinion, that he should be restored to full liberty. Not without reason, it was supposed that Huss would still never deviate from the main direction which he had always taken. The council had drawn up a resolution with regard to Huss in case he should recant, by which little more was granted him than barely permission to live. It ran as follows: Since it is evident, on the ground of certain conjectures and outward signs, that Huss repents of the sins he has committed, and is disposed to return with upright heart to the truth of the church, therefore the council grants with pleasure, that he may abjure and recant his heresies, and the heresies of Wicklif, as he voluntarily offers to do, and as he himself begs the council to release him from the ban which had been pronounced on him; so he is hereby released. But inasmuch as many disturbances and much scandal among the people have risen from these heresies, and inasmuch as great danger has accrued to the church by reason of his contempt of the power of the keys, therefore the council decrees, that he must be deposed from the priestly office, and from all other offices. The care of seeing to the execution of this decree is assigned to several bishops at the council, and Huss was to be condemned to imprisonment during life in some place appointed for that purpose.[1]

Huss himself was entirely ignorant of these transactions within the council; and being resolved not to recant till convinced of his errors, after what he had heard expressed at the council, he had nothing else in prospect but the stake, and nothing to wait for but the decision of his fate. Accordingly, with these expectations, he wrote, on the 10th of June, a letter to Bohemia, which he addressed to persons of all conditions, rich and poor, men and women. He exhorts them in the first place, faithfully to adhere to the truth which he had always set before them

[1] V. d. Hardt iv., pag. 432 and 433.

from the law of God; but, if anything had ever been uttered or written by him contrary to divine truth, he entreated them not to follow him in that thing. Furthermore, if any person had ever observed any lightness in his words or his actions, he begged such person not to lay it up, but pray God the Lord, that he would forgive him for it. He gives them admonitions suited to every condition; to the knights, burgher, and artisans; to masters and students. He recommends to them the knights who had so faithfully stood by him at the council of Constance: who had spoken with such boldness and energy for his cause and for his liberation, and particularly Wenzel of Duba and John of Chlum. These would furnish them the most reliable information with regard to all the proceedings. He ends and subscribes the letter as follows: "I write this letter in prison and in chains, expecting on the morrow to receive my sentence of death, full of hope in God, that I shall not swerve from the truth, nor abjure errors imputed to me by false witnesses. What a gracious God has wrought in me, and how he stands by me in wonderful trials, all this you will first understand when we shall again meet together, with our Lord God, through his grace in eternal joy." He moreover commends to the people of Prague the care of Bethlehem Church, against which the fury of Satan had been particularly directed, because from it especially had gone both the destruction of his kingdom, and the building up of the kingdom of God. He expresses the wish that God would send them a man as his successor, who would be a still more powerful preacher of gospel truth.[1] As there was now some delay in bringing the affair to a conclusion, new hopes might spring up in the mind of Huss; accordingly he wrote in one of his letters: "Our Saviour called to life Lazarus, after he had lain four days in the grave, and had on him the smell of corruption; preserved Jonah three days in the belly of the fish and sent him back again to preach; called forth Daniel from the den of lions to record the prophecies; kept from the flames the three men in the fiery furnace; liberated Susannah, when already condemned to death: therefore he could easily deliver me too, poor mortal, if it served to promote *his own* glory, the advancement of the faithful, and my own best good, for this time,

1 Mikowic, Letter 8.

from prison and from death. For *his* hand is not shortened, who by his angel led Peter, the chains falling from his hands, from the dungeon, when condemned already to die at Jerusalem. But ever let the will of the Lord be done, which I desire may be fulfilled in me to his glory and to my own purification from sin."[1] He concludes a letter written on the 26th of June, with the following words: "This letter is written in prison and in chains, while I am expecting death. Yet in view of the unsearchable ways of God, I dare not say that this letter is my last. The almighty God still lives; he can deliver me."[2] Of course his trial before the council had not answered his wishes nor his expectations. It was not the saving of his life about which he was chiefly anxious, but his most ardent desire was to have a trial from the council, with liberty to express himself freely and without being disturbed, on his doctrines and principles. This he still continually sought to obtain from the emperor, through the medium of his Bohemian friends. Accordingly he writes to his friends, "I still beg for God's sake, that all the nobles would unite in petitioning the emperor to allow me a *final* hearing." He interpreted that such a trial should be granted him, from the words addressed to him by the emperor at the second hearing, and added: "It must redound greatly to the emperor's dishonour, if those words shall not be fulfilled. But I think his words are about as much to be relied on as his safe conduct."[3] Finding himself disappointed in this hope, he wrote to the Bohemian Knights: "Trust not in princes, and the sons of men with whom there is no salvation, because the sons of men are false and deceitful. To-day they are, to-morrow they shall perish; but God abides for ever, who has his servants not for *his own* need, but for the advantage of his servants themselves, to whom he observes what he has promised, fulfils what he has engaged to do for them, never repelling from him any faithful servant, for he says, 'Where I am, there also shall my servant be.' Every servant thy master makes lord over all he possesseth, for he gives him himself, and with himself all things, that he may without care, without fear, nay without any cessation, possess all

1 Opp. i. fol. 68, 1; ep 32.

2 Mikowic, Letter 7.

3 Ibid. fol. 68, 2; ep. 34. Compare what has been quoted before from this letter.

things, sharing with all the saints in endless joy."[1] Also in another letter Huss writes: "This I have constantly borne on my heart, 'trust not in princes;' and the word Cursed is the man who trusts in men, and makes an arm of flesh his confidence!" He therefore counsels his friends to prudence.[2] Thus he writes to a friend near the emperor: "I thought that the emperor had some regard for the law of God and the truth; now I perceive that these weigh but little with him. He condemned me before my enemies did. Would that he could have shown but as much moderation as the heathen Pilate, who, after hearing the accusation, said, 'I find no fault in this man,' or would that he had said, at the least, I have given him a safe conduct, and if he refuses to submit to the decision of the council, I will send him back with your sentence and the evidence against him to the king of Bohemia, to be finally dealt with by him and his clergy."[3] In general it was a great mistake in Huss if he supposed that he should find in the princes of his time, who really had nothing but their own political interests in view, allies with himself against the hierarchy and for the reformation of the church. He sees a fulfilment of the prophecy of Revelation, that the kings would commit fornication with the great whore of Babylon, the corrupt church; for they had fallen away from Christ's truth, and embraced the lies of antichrist, yielding to seduction, or to fear, or induced by the hope of an alliance, and of obtaining the power of this world.[4]

Among the steps which were now taken with a view to persuade Huss to recant, the most worthy of notice are those of an unknown friend, perhaps the person referred to by Huss as one of the only two individuals favourably disposed to him at the council.[5] We may conjecture that he was one of those monks,

1 Ibid. fol. 64, 2; ep. 21.

2 Ibid. fol. 68, 2; ep. 33.

3 Ibid. fol. 69, 1; ep. 34.

4 Ibid. fol. 64, 2; ep. 22.

5 It was formerly supposed that the person here mentioned was a cardinal, though the way in which he speaks to Huss would by no means favour any such conjecture. Some readers finding in the letters of Huss, which we have already quoted, a person mentioned by the name of John Cardinalis, whom Huss warned against speaking so freely, and not recollecting that John Cardinalis, of Reinstein, of whom we have so often spoken, were led into the error of supposing that a cardinal by the name of John was here intended; and thus concluded, that Cardinal John, of Brogny, bishop of Ostia, commonly called Johannes Ostiensis, was the individual referred

the so-called friends of God, who, like Tauler's Staupitz, had in the solitude of their convents been led, through many conflicts of soul and inward experiences, to the knowledge of the great cardinal truth of the gospel, and to repose their trust in Christ *alone* as their Saviour; although at the same time they still clung fast, as did Luther also at the beginning, to the whole ancient church system, which itself became transfigured to their eyes, as viewed from that central point of their whole Christian life. It was a principle with these men, never to assume the position of polemics, but rather to work positively in preparing the way for the regeneration of the church, whose corruptions they deeply felt, by beginning at the very centre of Christianity. A person of this character would be a close and attentive observer of Huss, and would recognize in him a kindred spirit. He would only be inclined to disapprove of his too polemical and violent bent to reform, and lament that he should sacrifice himself by giving way to this, instead of preserving his life for the kingdom of God by accommodating himself to things as they were, and remaining within the church as salt wherewith it might be seasoned. Conformably to the principle so often to be met with amongst the mystics, the principle of monkish obedience, this pious man may have thought that Huss would do well to submit to the decision of his superiors at the council, as the organs of God, thus sacrificing his own self-will and recognizing a lesson from God, teaching him to observe greater moderation and prudence in his future labours for the promotion of reform. The great confidence with which he seems to have reckoned that if Huss would accept the form of recantation which he proposed to him, his affair might still be adjusted, would perhaps warrant us to conclude that he did not act solely on his own responsibility, but could rely on the concurrence of more powerful individuals. Now if we place this in connection with the fact that Cardinal Zabarella had promised Huss a form of recantation by which his conscience would be left undisturbed, it will appear not at all improbable, that the person of whom we are speaking stood somehow connected with this cardinal, and had arranged the

to. Lenfaut, in the History of the council of Constance, was the first to correct this mistake.

whole matter with him. Perhaps, as we might conjecture from the tone in which he speaks, he was himself the abbot of some convent. The recantation which this unknown individual proposed to Huss, was to this effect: "Besides the protestations made before by me, and which I hereby renew, I protest moreover that though a great deal has been charged against me which never entered my thoughts, yet I submit in all that has been charged against me, or objected to me, or extracted from my books, or even uttered against me by witnesses, humbly to the merciful direction, determination, and correction of the council, and agree to abjure, to recant, to submit to such merciful penance as may be imposed upon me, and to do all that the council may, in its goodness, see fit to determine for my salvation, commending myself with all submission to its mercy." This recantation being laid before him, Huss replied: "May the Almighty Father, the most wise and gracious God, bestow on my father who is so kind to me, for Christ's sake, the eternal life of glory! I am very grateful"—he writes—"most reverend father, for your paternal goodness. I do not venture to submit to the council, in the form which has been laid before me; first, because I should have to condemn many truths which they, as I have heard from themselves, call scandalous; next, because I should perjure myself by such abjuration, since I should have to declare myself guilty of those errors, and thus give great scandal to the people of God, who have heard the contrary from me in my preaching. If then that Eleazar, of whom it is written in the Books of the Maccabees that he would not falsely confess that he had eaten flesh forbidden by the law, lest he might act against God, and leave a bad example to those who should come after him, how should I, though an unworthy priest of the *new* law, through fear of a punishment which will soon be over, think of transgressing the law of God with a more grievous sin, first by departing from the truth; secondly, by incurring the guilt of perjury; and thirdly, by giving scandal to my neighbour? It would be far better for me to die than, in seeking to escape a momentary punishment, to fall into the hands of God, and perhaps afterwards into eternal fire and eternal shame. And since I have appealed to the Lord Jesus Christ, the almighty and most wise judge, committing into his hands *his own* cause, I

therefore abide his sentence and his most holy decision, knowing that he will not judge by false evidence and fallible councils, but according to the truth, and to every man's just deserts." His unknown friend, however, was not to be repelled by this language, but replied to the letter of Huss, bringing the matter once more directly home to his heart. *First*—he writes to him —let it not trouble you, my dearest *brother*, that you condemn truths, since it is not *you* that condemn them, but those who are your superiors, and for the present also mine. Give heed to that word, Lean not to thine own understanding (Prov. iii. 5). For there are many persons of knowledge and conscience at the council. My son, receive the law of thy mother. This, in relation to the first point. Next, as regards the second, the breaking of your oath; even if that perjury were really a perjury, still the guilt of it would not fall on you, but on those who require the oath. Next, there are no heresies, so far as you are concerned, when the obstinacy is removed. Augustin, Origen, and the Master of Sentences committed errors, and rejoiced to be set right again. I have often supposed that I understood a thing accurately, and yet was mistaken; when corrected, I have turned about cheerfully. I write with brevity, because I write to one who understands. You will not depart from the truth, but come nearer to the truth. You will not commit a perjury, but better the matter; you will occasion no scandal, but edify. Eleazar was a glorious Jew; still more glorious was the Jewess with the seven sons and eight martyrs (2 Macc. vii.). Paul was let down in a basket that he might advance the better cause. The judge to whom you appeal, the Lord Jesus, will release you from your appeal in consideration that contentions are still due from you to the faith for Christ.[1] To these representations Huss replied: "All this the council has often required of me.

1 Judex appellationis vestrae dominus Jesus det vobis apostolis, et sunt ii: Adhuc debentur tibi pro fide Christi certamina. The term "apostolis", is here used in the sense of the later judicial Greek and Latin—a document by which a court dismissed a person from its own jurisdiction, and granted him liberty to betake himself to another, allowed him a release from his appeal. Now, this document is represented as implied in the cited words: Huss is reserved for further contests in behalf of the faith. The writer, therefore, recognized the cause for which Huss contended as that of the faith, and placed hopes upon him, in case he should preserve his life, that he would still further promote the cause of the faith in fighting against the corruptions of the world.

But as[1] it is implied in it all that I recant, abjure, and submit to a penance, which would oblige me to deny many truths; next, as it would be a perjury to abjure errors falsely imputed to me; then, as I should by so doing give occasion of offence to many of God's people to whom I have preached; therefore it were better for me that a millstone were hung about my neck, and that I should be cast into the midst of the sea; and fourthly, if I complied to escape a brief punishment and shame, I should fall into the greatest punishment and shame, if I did not before my death feel the most poignant remorse for what I had done. The seven martyrs, therefore, belonging to the times of the Maccabees, come up before me to confirm me, who chose rather to be cut in pieces than to eat flesh contrary to the word of God. That Eleazar, too, comes up before me, who would not even say that he had eaten that which was forbidden by the law, lest he should leave a bad example to those who came after him, but chose rather to perish as a martyr. How should I then, who have before my eyes all those examples, and many holy men and women of the new covenant, who have surrendered themselves to martyrdom rather than consent to sin, I who have for so many years preached of patience and fortitude, how should I fall into many falsehoods and perjury and give scandal to many sons of God? Far, very far, be it from me to do any such thing; because the Lord Jesus Christ will most abundantly reward me, since he now gives me the help of patience.[2]

Huss was visited in his prison by several members of the council, both strangers and acquaintances, who sought to persuade him to recant in order to save his life. A doctor who visited him laboured to convince him that he would be innocent of all guilt if he submitted blindly to the decision of the council. He added: "If the council declared that thou hadst but one eye, when thou hast two eyes, thou wouldst still be bound to submit to their decision." Huss replied: "Though the whole world should tell me this, yet I could not admit it so long as I

1 [In the Latin text which, as we have often seen, is extremely incorrect, quia stands here, which Neander translates without taking care to get rid of the resulting anacoluthon. But, perhaps, it would be better read *primo*, and then let secundo, tertio, quarto, follow in their order. Editor.]

2 Opp. i., fol. 70; ep. 38, 39, 40, and 41.

have my reason, as I now exercise it, without gainsaying my conscience." After many words the doctor finally gave up the point, saying: "It is true, I have not chosen a good example."[1] Paletz himself[2] said to Huss that he ought not to dread the shame of recantation, but to look simply at the good which would come out of it. Huss replied: "It is a greater shame to be condemned and to be burned, than to recant; how should I, then, dread the shame? But give me your opinion; what would you do, if errors were ascribed to you which you had never taught? Would you consent to abjure them?" Paletz replied: "It is an awkward thing." And he began to weep.[3] Several who visited Huss endeavoured to convince him also on the ground of that monkish notion of humility, that he ought to feel no scruples about abjuring even what he had never taught, when it was required of him by the council; by so doing he would not be guilty of a lie; it would be but an act of submission to higher authority, an act of humility. Examples were cited of persons who, from humility, confessed themselves guilty of crimes they had never committed; such cases occurring in the histories of the ancient monks. An Englishman mentioned the example of persons in England suspected of Wicklifitism, among whom were several very worthy men, who all at the command of the bishop of Canterbury abjured the Wicklifite errors. But all this was quite at variance with that strict regard to truth which was a ruling principle with Huss.[4]

From his cell, Huss had contemplated the course of action pursued by the council. It could scarcely fail to make a great impression on his mind to see the pope, for whose authority men were so zealous, the man who had occasioned his imprisonment, afterwards deposed himself by the council, charged with the most atrocious crimes, and closely confined in the castle of Gottleben, which Huss had left. He recognised in all this a judgment of God, and could bring it in evidence against those advocates of papal absolutism, who accused him of high treason against the pope's authority. He writes:[5] "They have con-

1 Ibid. fol. 68, 1; ep. 32.

2 Huss relates this in a letter of the 23d of June.

3 Ibid. fol. 67, 1; ep. 30.

4 Ibid. fol. 67, 2; ep. 31.

5 On the 24th June, Mikowic, Letter 6.

demned their own head; what now can those men have to say, who hold the pope to be God on earth, and maintain that he cannot sin, cannot practise simony? that he is the head of the collective holy church, which he governs extraordinarily well? who say, he is the head of the holy church, which he spiritually nourishes; he is the fountain out of which flows all power and goodness; he is the sun of the church; he is the spotless asylum, and that to him every Christian must betake himself for refuge? Now"—says he—"this head is cut off, the earthly god is in chains, accused of sin, the fountain is dried up, the sun is eclipsed, the heart torn out, the asylum has fled from Constance, so that nobody can take refuge in him. His own council has accused him of heresy, because he made sale of indulgences, bishoprics, and other benefices; and those very persons have condemned him, of whom many bought their places of him, while many others push the same trade among themselves. He expresses his indignation that the pope should be condemned on account of simony by prelates, who, after their own fashion, practised the same iniquity. If Christ should address this council as he did those who asked him to condemn the woman taken in adultery,—he that is without sin among you let him cast the first stone at the pope, they would go out one after another. Wherefore did they kneel before the pope—kiss his feet, and call him most holy father, when they knew him to be guilty of a most atrocious crime? Wherefore did the cardinals choose for a pope one who was the murderer of his predecessor?" Thus he writes in another letter: "Now you may understand what the life of the clergy is who say they are true representatives of Christ and his apostles, who call themselves the most holy church, the most infallible council; and yet this same council has been in error; it has first honoured John the Twenty-third with bowed knee, and called him Most Holy, while yet they knew that he was a shameful murderer, and guilty of other crimes besides, as they themselves afterwards declared when they condemned him?"[1] In the abominations of the secularized church, Huss sees fulfilled already, as Janow had done, the predictions of Christ regarding the abomination in

[1] Opp. i. fol. 63, 2; ep. 19.

the holy place according to Daniel. He writes to the Bohemians, that they should not allow themselves to be terrified by the council of Constance; they would never go to Bohemia; many of the council would die before they could force the delivering up of the books of Huss in Bohemia. These books, like storks, would fly in all directions, from the council, dispersing into all quarters of the world; and when winter came, they would perceive what they had effected in the summer. Huss supposed that he had received many prophetic intimations in his dreams. "Know"—he writes to his friends—"that I have had great conflicts in my dreams. I dreamed beforehand of the flight of the pope. And after relating it, Chlum said to me in my dream, 'The pope will also return.' Then I dreamt of the imprisonment of Jerome, though not literally according to the fact. All the different prisons to which I have been conveyed have been represented beforehand to me in my dreams. There have often appeared to me serpents, with heads also on their tails; but they have never been able to bite me. I do not write this because I believe myself a prophet, or wish to exalt myself, but to let you know that I have had temptations both of body and soul, and the greatest fear lest I might transgress the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ."[1] Huss proved himself to be a genuine Christian martyr in the succession of Christ; for it was not with stoical apathy, not in the intoxication of fanaticism that renders obtuse the natural feelings of humanity, but with entire self-possession, in the undisturbed and full feeling of human weaknesses, contending with and conquering them by the power of faith, that he gave his life as an offering to God. This picture Huss exhibits to us in that noble letter which he wrote on holy eve before the festival of John the Baptist, when he says: "Much consoles me that word of our Saviour, 'Blessed be ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy; for behold your reward is great in heaven,' Luke vi. 22, 23. A good consolation; nay, the best consolation; difficult, however, if not to understand, yet perfectly to fulfil, to rejoice amid those suffer-

[1] Ibid. fol. 68, 2; ep. 33.

ings. This rule James observes, who says, My beloved brethren, count it all joy, when ye fall into divers temptations, knowing this, that the trying of your faith, if it is good, worketh patience, James i. 2, 3. Assuredly is it a hard thing to rejoice without perturbation, and in all these manifold temptations to find nothing but pure joy. Easy it is to say this, and to expound it, but hard to fulfil it in very deed. For even the most patient and steadfast warrior, who knew that he should rise on the third day, who by his death conquered his enemies, and redeemed his chosen from perdition, was after the Last Supper troubled in spirit, and said, My soul is troubled even unto death; as also the Gospel relates, that he began to tremble and was troubled; nay, in his conflict he had to be supported by an angel, and he sweat as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground; but he who was in such trouble said to his disciples, Let not your heart be troubled, and fear not the cruelty of those that rage against you, because ye shall ever have me with you to enable you to overcome the cruelty of your tormentors. Hence his soldiers, looking to him as their king and leader, endured great conflicts, went through fire and water, and were delivered. And they received from the Lord the crown of which James speaks, i. 12. That crown will God bestow on me and you, as I confidently hope, ye zealous combatants for the truth, with all who truly and perseveringly love our Lord Christ, who suffered for us, leaving behind an example that we should follow in his steps. It was necessary that he should suffer, as he tells us himself; and we must suffer, that so the members may suffer with the head; for so he says, Whoever would follow me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. O most faithful Christ, draw us weak ones after thee; for we cannot follow thee, if thou dost not draw us. Give us a strong mind, that it may be prepared and ready. And if the flesh is weak, let thy grace succour us beforehand, and accompany us, for without thee we can do nothing; and least of all can we face a cruel death. Give us a ready and willing spirit, an undaunted heart, the right faith, a firm hope, and perfect love, that patiently and with joy we may for thy sake give up our life." He subscribes this letter as follows: "Written in chains, on the vigils of St John, who, because he rebuked wickedness, was beheaded in prison. May he pray

for us to the Lord Jesus Christ!"[1] Huss requested permission before his death to confess himself, and at first chose his most violent opponent, Paletz. He had so far overcome every feeling of indignation and revenge, as to be willing to confess to him. He begged the commissioners to grant him Paletz, or some other one. They sent him a doctor of theology, who was a monk. This person heard the confession of Huss, and spoke to him kindly and piously, as Huss relates. He counselled him as the others had done, to recant; he did not make it however a condition of absolution, but gave him the latter without it. This is worthy of notice, since Huss, if he did not recant, if the ban under which he had lain was not removed, being still an obstinate heretic, could not properly obtain absolution. We may conclude therefore, with some probability, that this monk too, like the above mentioned unknown friend, belonged to the number of those whose judgment of Huss differed from that of the council.[2] In the prospect of death Huss expressed the pain he felt at not having succeeded in bringing together his beloved Bohemian nation under a common Christian and national interest, at being forced into a controversy on that subject with those who were his dearest friends. Accordingly he writes[3] to the masters and bachelors and students of the Prague university. I admonish you in the most gracious Jesus, that you mutually love one another, lay aside divisions and seek before all things the glory of God, remembering me, how I ever had in view the advancement of the university for the glory of God, how much I was troubled at your dissensions and your false steps, how I strove to knit together our excellent nation in unity. And behold how this nation in some of those, who were dearest to me, for whom I would willingly have sacrificed my life, has become bitter to me by the shame it has brought on me and by their calumnies, and at length they bring me to a bitter death. May the Almighty God forgive them, because they knew not what they did. For the rest, stand fast in the truth ye have known, which will triumph over all and is mighty through eternity."[4] When Paletz last visited Huss, and the latter besought his forgiveness for any abusive or scornful language which he might have used

1 Ibid. fol. 67, 1 et 2; ep. 30.
2 Ibid. fol. 67, 2; ep. 31.
3 On the 27th June.
4 Ibid. fol. 63, 1; ep. 18.

towards him, particularly for his language in the tract written against him, where he had styled him the "Fictor," the hardened man was moved to tears; but he always firmly held that much evil had been wrought in Bohemia by Huss and his adherents.[1]

It characterizes Huss that in spite of the weighty cares and interests of a general nature that occupied his mind, and in the midst of his own personal sufferings and conflicts, he still preserved in his heart the tenderest regard for his friends who were to survive him, following in this respect also the pattern of his Saviour, who showed forth his love to his own even unto death. In one of his last letters,[2] he expresses to the knight of Chulm his delight at learning that he meant to renounce the vanities and toilsome service of the world, and retiring to his estate, devote himself wholly to the service of the Lord Jesus Christ, whose service was perfect freedom. In like manner he expresses joy at learning that the knight Wenceslaus of Duba had resolved to retire from the world and to marry. "It is even time for him," he writes, "to take a new course; for he has already made journeys enough through this kingdom and that, jousting in tournaments, wearing out his body, squandering his money and doing injury to his soul. It only remains for him therefore to renounce all these things, and remaining quietly at home, with his wife, serve God, with his own domestics around him. Far better will it be thus to serve God, without cares, without participation in the sins of the world, in good peace and with a tranquil heart, than to be distracted with cares in the service of others, and that too at the imminent risk of his salvation." He wrote as a postscript: "This is to be placed in the hands of my most trusty friend, that he may read it."[3] He writes to his friend Christann:[4] "My friend and special benefactor, stand fast in the truth of Christ, and embrace the cause of the faithful. Fear not, because the Lord will shortly bestow his protection and increase the number of his faithful. Be gentle to the poor as thou ever wast. Chastity, I hope, thou has preserved; covetousness thou hast avoided, and continue to avoid it; and for thy own sake do not hold several benefices at once; ever retain *thy own* church, that the faithful may resort

1 Ibid. fol. 67, 2; ep. 31.
2 On the 29th June, ibid. fol. 64, 2; ep. 22.
3 Ibid. fol. 65, 1; ep. 23.
4 See above, page 421.

for help to thee, as to an affectionate father." He salutes Jacobellus and all the friends of the truth. The letter is subscribed: "Written in prison, awaiting my execution at the stake."[1] Last of all, he addressed, while still in the immediate expectation of death, a letter to his friends in Prague, with his farewell salutations and commissions. He besought them that for his sake, who would be already dead as to the body, they would do all that lay in their power to prevent the knight of Chlum from coming into any danger. "I entreat you," he writes, "that you would live by the word of God, that you would obey God and his commandments as I have taught you. Express to the king my thanks for all the kindnesses he has shown me. Greet in my name your families and your friends, each and all of whom I cannot enumerate. I pray to God for you; do you pray for me? To Him we shall all come, since he gives us help." Thus wrote Huss, probably on the 4th of July, when he was expecting his martyrdom on the next day. He added, "Already I trust I shall suffer for the sake of the word of God." He begged his friends for God's sake not to suffer that any cruelty whatever should be practised against the servants and the saints of God. In a postscript, he sent his fur cloak as a token of remembrance to Peter of Mladenowic.[2]

Thus wrote Huss in the prospect of death, for already was his fate decided by his constant refusal to recant. On the 1st of July an official deputation of the council led by John of Wallenrod, Bishop of Riga, appeared before Huss and invited him once more to recantation; when he declared his resolution in writing, as he had already declared it by word of mouth to individuals. The document concluded with these words: "Were it possible that my voice could now reach to the whole world, as each one of my sins and every falsehood I have uttered will, on the day of judgment, be made known before all, I would most joyfully before the whole world recant everything false and erroneous which I have ever had it in my thoughts to say, or have ever said. This I say and write of my own free will." On the 5th of July, appeared a deputation from the emperor, consisting

1 Ibid. fol. 63, i.; ep. 17.

2 Ibid. fol. 65, 1; ep. 24.

of four prelates, among whom were the cardinals d'Ailly and Zabarella, accompanied by the two Bohemian knights, so often mentioned; and Huss was led out from his cell. Chlum addressed Huss in these words: "I am an unlettered man, and know not how to advise you, who are a learned man. Yet I beseech you, if you are conscious of any error in that which has been publicly brought against you by the council, do not shrink from altering your opinion according to their will; but if you are not, I shall not lead you to the false step of doing aught contrary to your conscience; I much rather advise you to suffer any punishment sooner than deny the truth of which you are well assured." Huss answered weeping: "I call God the Almighty, as I have often done, to witness that from my heart I am ready, whenever the council teaches me anything better by testimonies from Holy Scripture, to change my opinion at once and to confess publicly under oath, that I was previously in an error." Thereupon one of the bishops standing by remarked in a bitter tone, "He would never be so arrogant as to set his own judgment above the decision of the whole council." To this Huss replied, "Nor am I of any other mind; for if he who is least in the council can convict me of an error, I will gladly do all that the council requires of me." "Mark," said the bishops at this, "how obstinately he clings to his errors!" And so they returned back to the emperor with this final declaration of Huss.

On the 6th of July, Huss appeared before the assembled council, at which the emperor also was present, seated upon his throne, surrounded by the princes, and with the insignia of the empire. In the middle of the hall where the council met, stood a sort of table, and near it a wooden frame or stand, upon which were hung the priestly vestments which Huss was to put on previous to his degradation. After an introductory discourse the process was read, together with all the articles of complaint, and from the whole the conclusion was drawn that Huss was a follower of Wicklif, and had disseminated Wicklifite doctrines. Various errors and heresies were ascribed also to Huss himself, with various qualifications, and he was pronounced an obstinate, incorrigible heretic. One of the points here specified was the appeal of Huss to Jesus Christ, which was characterised as an

overleaping of the constituted instances of ecclesiastical courts, as an act of infatuation, and a contempt of church jurisdiction.[1] Huss attempted, more than once, to interpose a word in defence of himself against the allegations; but he was not permitted to proceed. He pled once more for liberty to vindicate himself, lest those present might suppose that the things alleged against him were true. But when he found that all was of no avail, falling upon his knees, he commended in prayer his whole cause to God and to Christ. Though commanded to be silent, he felt impelled, during the reading of the process against him and the pronouncing of his sentence, occasionally to utter a word in vindication of himself. He expressed himself with great presence of mind, uniting confidence with humility. When his appeal to Christ was, for the reasons above stated, condemned as heretical, he said: "O Christ! whose word is, by this council, publicly condemned, I appeal to thee anew, thou who, when thou wast ill intreated by thine enemies, didst appeal to thy Father, thy cause thou didst commit to that most righteous judge, that we, following thy example, might, when oppressed by injustice, take refuge in thee." When it was objected to Huss that he had remained for so long a time under the ban, and yet held mass, he told what he had done to obtain his acquittal and the removal of the ban, and concluded by stating how he had come to the council of his own accord with a safe-conduct from the emperor. In saying this, he turned and looked the emperor full in the face. The latter is said to have blushed.[2] When Huss was pronounced an obstinate heretic, he said: "I never was obstinate; but as I have always demanded, up to this hour, so now I ask only to be informed of what is better from Holy Scripture; and I confess that so earnestly do I strive after the truth, that if with a word I could destroy the errors of all heretics, there is no peril I would not willingly incur for that end." When his books were condemned, he said: "Wherefore condemn ye them, when you have not offered a single argument to prove that they are at

1 Cum appellationem ad dominum Jesum Christum, tanquam supremum judicem omissis ecclesiasticis mediis interposuit. Histor. Hussi, opp. i. fol. 27, 2.

2 This is so stated by V. d. Hardt, iv., pag. 393: Haec cum loqueretur, oculos in imperatorem defixos habuit. Ille vero statim vehementer erubuit, atque ejus verecundus tinxerat ora rubor.

variance with the Holy Scriptures and with the articles of faith? And what injustice is this, that ye condemn, with the rest of my books written in the Bohemian tongue? books that ye have never seen, much less read!" At times he prayed with his eyes fixed heavenward. When his sentence had been read to the end, falling upon his knees, he said: "Lord Jesus! forgive my enemies; as thou knowest that I have been falsely accused by them, and that they have used against me false testimony and calumnies. Forgive them for the sake of thy great mercy!" These words were received with laughter by many. Next followed his degradation from the spiritual order, which was performed by seven bishops selected for this purpose. First, he was clad with the priestly vestments. Through the whole of this transaction, the example of Christ stood distinctly before Huss, whose steps he was conscious of following in all the insults he had to endure. In this sense he interpreted many parts of the proceeding. Invested with the priestly robes, he was called upon once more by the bishops to show some regard for his honour and his soul's salvation, and recant. Addressing himself with tears to the people who stood around, he said: "These worshipful bishops require it of me to confess before you all that I have erred. If this thing were of such a nature that it could be done so as to involve only the disgrace of a single individual, they would more easily persuade me to it. But I now stand before the eyes of my God, without dishonouring whom, as well as meeting the condemnation of my own conscience, I cannot do this. For I know that I have never taught anything of the kind that I have been falsely accused of teaching; but have always thought, written, and taught the contrary. With what face could I look to heaven, with what brow could I meet those who have heard my teaching, of whom the number is great, if by my fault it should happen that what hitherto they were most certainly assured of through me, should be made uncertain to them? Should I by my example destroy the peace of so many souls whom I have made familiar with the most settled testimonies of Scripture, and with the purest doctrines of the gospel, and thereby fortified against all the assaults of Satan? Far be it from me that I should value this my mortal body more highly than the salvation of those souls." This, too, which was now

spoken by him, was construed as a proof of his obstinacy in his heresies. The several articles of his dress were then removed, piece by piece, with set forms of expression. When the cup of the eucharist was taken from his hands, with the words: "We take from thee, condemned Judas, the cup of salvation," he answered: "But I trust in God, my Father, the Almighty, and my Lord Jesus Christ, for whose name I bear this, that he will not take from me the cup of his salvation; and I have a firm hope that I shall yet drink of it to-day in his kingdom." A dispute having arisen about the mode of removing his tonsure, Huss said to the emperor: "I am surprised when all are alike cruel, they cannot agree among themselves about the *mode* of cruelty." A cap painted over with devils was then placed on his head, with the inscription: "arch-heretic." But he said: "My Lord Jesus Christ wore, on my account, a crown of thorns; why should not I be willing, for his sake, to wear this easier though shameful badge. I will do it, and gladly." When this was done, the bishops said: "Now we give over thy soul to the devil." "But I"—said Huss, raising his eyes to heaven—"commend into thy hands, Jesus Christ, my soul, by thee redeemed." Huss, cast forth from the church, was now delivered over to the secular arm. The emperor then commanded Duke Louis of Bavaria to consign Huss to the executioners of justice. When, on being led away by them, he beheld his books burning before the doors of the church, he smiled. He bade all whom he passed not to believe that he was about to die for the sake of some erroneous doctrine, but that it was only through the hatred and malice of his adversaries, who had brought against him false accusations. On arriving at the place of execution, Huss fell upon his knees and prayed, in the words of a few psalms, particularly the fifty-first and thirty-first. He was heard often to repeat the words: "Into thy hands, Lord, I commit my spirit." When laymen, standing by, heard this, they said: "What he may have done before, we know not; but now we see and hear him pray and speak most devoutly!" When compelled to rise from his knees, he said: "Lord Jesus Christ! stand by me, that by thy help I may be enabled, with a strong and steadfast soul, to endure this cruel and shameful death, to which I have been condemned on

account of the preaching of the holy gospel and thy word." Huss then permitted his first prison-keepers to come near him, and said to them in the German language: "I thank you, my dearest brethren, for all the kind attentions you have shown me, for you waited upon me like dearest brothers, to say nothing of your being my keepers. And be assured that I have a firm trust in my Saviour, in whose name I will, with good courage, suffer this kind of death, believing that I shall to-day reign with him."[1] He then explained, as he had done before, the cause of his death to the people. When he was placed upon the faggots, bound fast to the stake, and chained to it by the neck, he said; "I willingly wear these chains for Christ's sake, who wore still more grievous ones." Before the pile was lighted, the marshal of the empire, Von Pappenheim, rode up to him and called upon him once more to recant. But he said; "What error should I recant, when I am conscious of no error? for I know that what has been falsely brought against me, I never thought, much less have I ever preached. But the chief aim of my preaching was to teach men repentance and the forgiveness of sins according to the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ and the expositions of the holy fathers; therefore am I prepared to die with a joyful soul." The fire being kindled, Huss commenced singing, with a loud voice: "Jesus, Son of the living God, have mercy upon me." As he was beginning to repeat this for the third time, his voice was stifled by the flames, which the wind drove towards him; yet his lips were seen for a long time to move, as in prayer. The ashes of his body, when burned, were cast into the Rhine, so that nothing might remain of him to pollute the earth, precisely as the ashes of Polycarp were disposed of by the Pagans.

We have still to speak of the fellow combatant of Huss, *Jerome of Prague*. This person, who appeared sometimes in the character of a philosopher and theologian, sometimes in that of a knight and man of the world, had created a still greater and more general stir than Huss. He had laboured in countries the most diverse to promote the cause of reform, and had displayed far greater zeal than the more practical Huss in diffusing the doctrines of

1 V. d. Hardt. iv. pag. 447.

Wicklif. In Bohemia and Moravia, he had extended his influence among all classes.[1] Then again he had produced great commotions at several universities by his zeal in defending the doctrines of Wicklif, for example in Paris and Heidelberg. In Paris he had more opposition to encounter from the fact that this university was a seat of nominalism. Wicklif's doctrine concerning God's almighty power, which he there set forth, would in particular arouse the suspicion of one so zealously devoted to uniformity of doctrine and so prejudiced against everything of an abnormal and eccentric nature as Chancellor Gerson. The latter was prepared to bring him to trial, where he was to be forced to a recantation; but he was informed of it in time to make his escape.[2] Next we find him in Vienna, where also he excited disturbances. The magistrates caused him to be arrested, but afterwards set him at liberty. And he was still later accused at Constance of having brought this about by deceiving the magistrate, promising that he would make up his mind to recant, and that he would not leave Vienna until the end of his trial.[3] From the castle of Wietow he addressed to the official a letter, excusing his flight on the ground that his promise had been given under constraint. "You are to know," he wrote, "that I am at the castle of Wietow,

1 To this there is doubtless special allusion in what the abbot of Dola says, when speaking of persons, who, after wandering through many countries, laboured to disseminate Wicklifite doctrines in Bohemia and Moravia, at the courts of princes, in cathedral churches, in convents, even among the Carthusians, and among people of both sexes, and among students at the universities: Quidam insani magistri Wiclefitici ordinis et schismatis non solum post discursum peregrinarum nobis terrarum et districtuum etiam in terris nostris, Bohemiae et Moraviae, aulas principum, collegia et cathedras sacerdotum, scholas studentium, promiscui sexus popularem tumultum fidelium, antra deserti claustralium, sed etiam segregatas in partem et pacem silentii Cartusiensium cellulas cum terrore valido (repleverunt) vehementer. Antiwikleffus, in Pez iv. 2, pag. 157 et 158.

2 We take this from the trial of Jerome at Constance, where he is reproached with the fact: Cum Hieronymus saepius de articulis Wicleff incepisset conferre, aliosque ad conferendum induxisset, laudasset et commendasset Joannem Wicleff et ejus perversam doctrinam, tandem in quadam disputatione publica dictos errores publice tenuit, et praesertim, quod deus nihil possit annihilare. Tandem quum esset per plures magistros Parisienses graviter notatus et vehementer de haeresi per eos habitus suspectus, iidem magistri et praesertim Joann. de Gersone ipsum ad revocandum hujusmodi errores compulisset. Sed Hieronymus, ubi sescitur per quem avisatus, occulte civitate et studio recessit. V. d. Hardt. iv. pag. 680 et 681.

3 (Viennae) propter infamiam haereseos per officialem curiae fuit arrestatus, et juravit et sub poena excommunicationis promisit, de oppido Viennensi nullatenus recedere, neque se absentare, caet. Ibid, pag. 638.

sound and hearty, with many friends ever ready to serve you and yours. And I pray you excuse me with regard to the promise you forced from me, as you will do, if you weigh well the import of such a promise. For we by no means intend to evade the law, but are always ready to hold ourselves responsible to it if a suitable guaranty of just treatment is given us. Yet to stand alone amidst so many hundred enemies is what you would not advise me to do yourself if you truly loved me. But my soul has escaped like a sparrow from the net of the fowlers; the snare is broken, and we are free. Still I thank you, and shall always thank you. Do but send me all my adversaries with the witnesses to Prague; there I will meet them in fair debate. Or, if it should be more convenient for them, let us together go to the court (probably of Rome,) where they will have quite as many acquaintances as I have."[1] In his defence of himself at Constance, Jerome justifies his conduct on the ground, that the proceedings of the official against him were wholly irregular, since he had no lawful authority over him, belonging, as he did, to another diocese.[2] Accordingly he looked upon the whole proceeding as an exercise of arbitrary power, and thought himself fully justified in making his escape from it. It could not justly be exacted of him to stay and await his own death at the stake, which was inevitable.[3] We next find him, in the year 1410, in Ofen, where he appeared before the emperor Sigismund and many bishops. It was not till the archbishop Zbynek had entered a complaint against him in a letter to the emperor, that he was arrested by the latter, and handed over to the archbishop of Gran. This archbishop kept him under arrest only five days, and treated him with kindness. It was owing perhaps to the mediation of this prelate that the king dismissed him without demanding further security.[4] Next having left Prague immediately after those commotions in 1413, of which we have given an account, Jerome visited King Wladislaw of

1 Ibid. pag. 683.

2 Violenter arrestatus fui, nec quicquam mecum juridice, sed violenter actum est, nec habebant quicquam jurisdictionis super me, quia de alia eram dioecesi.

3 Nec furtive nec contumaciter recessi, sed violentiam mihi ab iis infligendam exspectare non volui, prout nec tenebar, nec debui. Ibid. pag. 638.

4 In the complaints laid against Jerome at Constance, the affair is represented as if Jerome had been arrested and imprisoned, and then banished from Hungary by the Emperor Sigismund on account of the Wicklifite errors disseminated by him.

Poland, and Duke Witold of Lithuania. He appeared in Cracow, and there excited great commotions. Albert, bishop of Cracow, who stood forth as his opponent, supposes it is true that he found no acceptance there, and no susceptible soil for his opinions amongst that simple people. But he contradicts himself, when he says at the same time, that such violent commotions had never been produced there by any individual since the memory of man. If the soil had been so unsusceptible, such effects could not have been produced. The truth may be, that the great mass of the simple people were offended at him and would not hear him; but he must have found adherents among others.[1] He was accused at Constance of having shown a disposition to favour the Greek Church in Lithuania. Thus he is said to have made his appearance in the cities of Witepsk and Plescow, and to have participated there without scruple in the communion of the Greek Church which was devoted to the Russians. He is said to have endeavoured to persuade Duke Witold to apostatize from the Latin Church. Jerome could say in defence of himself, that in the case of Duke Witold the only question debated by him was, whether baptism, performed according to the rites of the Greek Church on a great number of people who were disposed to come over to the Latin Church, was to be recognized as valid, or whether it was necessary that they should be rebaptized, and he maintained the validity of such a baptism, holding it only to be necessary that such persons should be more exactly instructed in the doctrines of the Latin Church.[2] We may well suppose that those persons, who were seeking every way to stigmatize Jerome and Huss as heretics, and whose sayings, as is apparent from the facts already exhibited, were little

But the report of Jerome is certainly, in itself, the more probable one; for, if Jerome was arrested on account of Wicklifite heresies, and subjected to an examination, his judges would not have been content with merely banishing him from Hungary.

1 The bishop writes: Venit huc personaliter, et prima die barbatus apparuit, secunda vero imberbis stolatus, tunica rubra et caputio foderato, pelibus griseis, se gloriosum ostendebat, coram ipso rege, regina, principum, baronum ac procerum frequentia. Qui tamen licet hic paucis diebus moraretur, majores in clero et populo fecit commotiones, quam fuere factae a memoria hominum in diocesi ista.—Terra nostra ad semen suum videtur esse arida capiendum et fructum afferendum, eo quod simplex plebicula tanti philosophi dogmata comprehendere non valet, et multo minus terrae Lituanorum et Russiae caet. According to a citation in Palacky, iii., 1 p. 301, note 412.

2 V. d. Hardt, iv., pag. 643.

worthy of credence; that such persons by means of their sophistical reasonings from facts as simple as the above described might seize upon and pervert such cases so as to answer their own ends. At the same time it may be true also, that Jerome had given some occasion for such accusations, by his rather liberal conversations on the subject of the relation of the Greek to the Latin Church. Proceeding as he doubtless did on the same fundamental idea of the church with Huss, and so apprehending this idea after a more spiritual and inward manner, approaching more nearly to the idea of the invisible church, he may perhaps from this point of view have risen superior to the points of opposition between the two churches, recognized genuine members of the church even amongst the Russians, and sought to encourage efforts to bring about a union between the two churches. If even such a man as Chancellor Gerson, distinguishing the more essential from the more unessential, expressed himself with mildness on the relation of the Greek Church to the Latin, and sought to prepare the way for negotiations of union, how much more might this be done by Jerome, who rose far above the narrow limits of Parisian theology. Jerome had, in the meantime, returned to Prague. The imprisonment of Huss had taken place. He could not bear to leave his friend and fellow-combatant alone in this crisis. He appeared at first incognito and secretly at Constance, on the 4th of April, 1415. But as he must soon ascertain that he would not be heard, and could not be safe there, he left Constance again, and repaired the next day to the small town of Ueberlingen four miles distant. From thence he wrote to the emperor[1] and cardinals, and offered, if a safe conduct were granted him, publicly to answer before any one to every charge of heresy that might be brought against him. Not being able to obtain such a safe conduct, he caused to be affixed the next day, on the gates of the emperor's palace, on the doors of the principal churches, the residences of the cardinals, and other eminent prelates, a notice in the Bohemian, Latin, and German languages, wherein he declared himself ready, provided only he should have full liberty and security to come to

1 It is his secretary, whose report is our authority for these statements: for he uses the expression: Scripsit *per me* literas. Cfr. Joann. Hus opp. ii., fol. 349 seq.

Constance and to leave it again, to defend himself in public before the council against every accusation made against his faith. Not obtaining what he demanded, he procured a certificate to be drawn up to that effect by the Bohemian knights resident in Constance and sealed with their seals, and with this to serve as a vindication of himself to his friends, he turned his face towards Bohemia. But as he travelled slowly, at conflict with himself, his enemies succeeded in way-laying him, and getting possession of his person. He was arrested near Hirschau, a small town in Suabia. Meantime, as an answer to the notices posted up by Jerome at Constance, followed a citation of the council, calling upon him to defend himself before a public session of that body. A safe conduct was granted him, in terms implying that he was to have no security for his person, it being promised him that he should suffer no violence, so far as this could be allowed without detriment to justice.[1] At the request of the council and by the emperor's command, Jerome was now conducted in chains to the council on the 23d of May, and he appeared before a public convocation of the same body in the Franciscan convent. In this assembly, he encountered a number of eminent men from the Universities of Paris, Heidelberg, and Cologne, who recollected him, and triumphed over the man who had once given them so much alarm. Accordingly, one after another addressed him, and reminded him of the propositions which he had set forth. The first among these was Chancellor Gerson, who captiously charged him with wanting to set himself up as an angel of eloquence, and with exciting great commotions at Paris by maintaining the reality of general conceptions. We may observe here, as well as in other like examples, the strong propensity which now prevailed to mix up together philosophical and theological disputes. But Jerome distinguished one from the other, and declared that he, as a university master, had maintained such philosophical doctrines as had no concern with faith. In reference to all that had been objected to him by different parties, he held himself ready to recant as soon as he was taught anything better. Amid the noisy shouts was heard the cry, "Jerome must be burnt."

1 Ad quod a violentia, justitia semper salva, omnem tibi salvum conductum nostrum quantum in nobis est et fides exigit orthodoxa, tenore praesentium offerimus Opp. ii. fol. 350, 1.

He answered with coolness, "Well, if you wish my death, let it come in God's name!" But the archbishop of Salzburg said, "Not that; for God has said, He wills not the death of the sinner, but that he should turn." Meanwhile, after the prelates had retired, Peter of Mladenowic, sent by Huss, came to the window of the room in which Jerome was to be found, and exhorted him to stand fast by the truth, and not to shrink even from dying for that truth for which he had so stoutly spoken. Jerome replied that he hoped, with the grace of God, to remain faithful to the truth even unto death; they had talked a good deal about death, now they were to learn what it *was*. He was now delivered over by the archbishop of Riga, in the night time, to a guard, who led him prisoner into a tower, where he was bound, to a stake, with his hands, feet, and neck, so that he could scarcely move his head. Thus he lay two days with nothing to eat but bread and water. Then for the first time he obtained, through the mediation of Peter of Mladenowic, who had been told of his situation by his keepers, other means of subsistence. This severe imprisonment threw him into a violent fit of sickness. He demanded a confessor, which was at first refused, then granted with great difficulty. After he had already spent several months in this severe confinement, he heard of the martyrdom of his friend. His death and the imprisonment of Jerome produced the greatest exasperation of feeling among the knights in Bohemia and Moravia. On the 2d of September they put forth a letter to the council, in which they expressed their indignation, declared that they had known Huss but as a pious man, zealous for the doctrines of the gospel; and that he had fallen a victim only to his enemies and the enemies of his country. They entered a bitter complaint against the captivity of the innocent Jerome, who had made himself famous by his brilliant gifts; perhaps he too had already been murdered like Huss. They declared themselves resolved to contend even to the shedding of their blood, in defence of the law of Christ and of his faithful servants.[1] The council now had to fear, that should Jerome experience the like fate with Huss, new oil would be added to the flames already kindled among the Bohemians, and

[1] V. d. Hardt, iv. pag. 495.

violent agitations would begin from that quarter in the church. Hence they must use every effort to induce Jerome to recant. And hence he was caused repeatedly to appear before the council, where they hoped he might yield. The tedious length of his close confinement, which had now lasted near half a year, and his longing desire for liberty, at length brought Jerome to a point where he gave in, and consented to offer a recantation. This was in the month of September. But it was deemed important by the council that the recantation should be made in the most public manner possible; and a general assembly of the council was therefore appointed for this purpose. Accordingly Jerome appeared in the 19th session, on the 23d of September, 1415, and read a prescribed form of recantation, abjuring all the heresies of which he was accused, namely, all the heresies of Wicklif and Huss, acquiescing in the sentence passed by the council upon them both, and making several other declarations, such as the council required of him. One of these particularly deserving of notice, was his retractation of the assertion, that without the doctrine of the reality of general conceptions (de universalibus realibus) the Christian faith could not be defended. Here we have another example of the close connection which then prevailed between philosophical and theological polemics. After this Jerome was conducted back to his prison, but no longer closely fettered. Having now done all that was required of him, he had a right to claim his liberty. This was even acknowledged by the commission appointed to conduct his trial, at the head of whom stood cardinal d'Ailly. But Paletz and Michael de Causis and monks who came from Prague endeavoured to raise suspicions against Jerome's recantation, and hinted at the disastrous consequences which would result from his being set at large. And there was indeed every reason to fear, that Jerome, as soon as he got back to Bohemia, would once more place himself at the head of the reform movement. Besides, Chancellor Gerson added weight to the current suspicions against Jerome by a tract of his, "On protestations in matters of faith." Remarks, too, may have dropped from his own lips, betraying the true temper of his mind, and which would be made the most of by his enemies. But his judges, who confined themselves to the simple facts of the case, insisted on Jerome's liberation. The above mentioned

Bohemians zealously opposed them and hinted at bribery. The members of the commission finally threw up their office; a new commission was appointed; and Jerome was subjected to new examinations. At length he refused to submit to any more private examinations, and demanded a public trial, where he would express himself freely.

On the twenty-third of May, Jerome finally obtained the desired public hearing before the assembled council. New articles of complaint were to be brought against him. He demanded liberty to speak first of himself. This was not granted him. He should answer first to the articles of complaint. He was required to bind himself by oath to speak the truth; but he declined taking an oath, as he did not acknowledge the competency of the new tribunal, nor the regularity of the new examination. On the twenty-third and the twenty-sixth of May he defended himself, from seven o'clock in the morning till one in the afternoon, against all the accusations, one by one; unravelled in a connected discourse all the events in Prague in which he had taken a part, with such presence of mind, such eloquence, so much wit, as to excite universal admiration. Then, finally, he was allowed to speak of himself; and it was expected that he would only complain of the injustice of the new examination, appealing to the fact that he had done all that could be required of him, and close with demanding that the acquittal which had been put off so long should now be granted him. He actually commenced with something of this sort, describing the injustice of renewing the process against him, complaining of his new judges, and protesting against the competency of this new tribunal. But soon his discourse took a new turn altogether. In a dazzling strain of eloquence he brought up, one after another, those men who among pagans, Jews, and Christians had fallen victims to false accusations, and particularly to priestly hatred. He spoke of Socrates, Seneca, Boethius, John the Baptist, Stephen, and last of all, John Huss; enthusiastically dilating on the latter, as a man known to him only by his zeal for piety and truth; one who had drawn down upon himself the persecutions of a worldly-minded clergy only by the faithfulness with which he rebuked their corruption. He ended by declaring that there was no one of his sins he more painfully rued, than that of

having suffered himself to be moved by the fear of death to acquiesce in the condemnation of that saintly confessor of the truth. He took back all he had said concerning Wicklif and Huss. He declared that he assuredly should not be the last of those who would fall victims to the cunning malignity of bad priests; and turning round to his judges he exclaimed: "I trust in God, my Creator, that one day, after this life, you shall see Jerome preceding you and summoning you all to Judgment, and then you must render your account to God, and to me, if you have proceeded against me wrongfully.[1] This last declaration of Jerome was his death-warrant. But partly by his eloquence and presence of mind, contrasted with his emaciated looks, in which were depicted the

1 V. d. Hardt iv., 757. In the Hist. Hieronym. opp. ii., fol. 352, 2, the account does not seem to be so exact as in the copy of the acts of the council in V. d. Hardt. In that account the chronological order of events seems not to have been regarded. According to the acts, Jerome spoke these words at the conclusion of his speech, on the 26th of May, and thus the beginning and the conclusion of this speech agree very well together. According to the report in the Hist. Hieronym., Jerome, on the contrary, did not speak these words until the 30th of May, after the speech introducing the motion for his trial. Moreover, the style of language in the acts wears more the impress of originality. We find in the other review of facts in the Hist. Hier., vague or indefinite statements exchanged for others more definite. For example, in the acts, the words run: Quod *ana vice* post hanc vitam haberent videre Hieronymum eos praecedere et eos omnes ad judicium vocare. In the Hist. Hier., on the other hand, the indefinite expression *una vice* is converted into a "hundred years after this life," for which we can see no reason whatever, even though we suppose a reference to the German reformation, which, however, would not be suitable in this connection even if considered as a prophecy. The passage in the Hist. Hier. is as follows: Cito vos omnes, ut respondeatis mihi coram altissimo et justissimo judice *infra centum annos*. We see how these words, by gradual changes, and by being transferred from Jerome to Huss, gave occasion to that prophecy of Luther which was ascribed to Huss, and which has been handed down to posterity by the medals commemorative of the jubilee of the reformation: Centum revolutis annis deo et mihi reddetis rationem, which had some connection also with the really prophetic utterances which we meet with in Huss. But, in Huss, we find a prophetic consciousness, such as is ever wont to be possessed by the witnesses of evangelical truth in contending against antichristian errors,—the consciousness that the truth, of which they serve as the organs, will not succumb in the contest, but come forth out of it triumphant and more resplendent than before. Huss was fully convinced and assured, as we have seen, that although he himself must perish in this contest, yet still more powerful preachers of the truth and champions for it than he was, would be raised up after him by the Spirit of God. But Huss had no distinct individual, as Luther, before his mind, and his thoughts were rather upon Bohemia than upon Germany. We can only say: What the spirit of prophecy inspired in the mind of Huss went into fulfilment, but in a different way from what he supposed. What began in Bohemia, and perished after the stormy scenes that followed, was carried triumphantly through in Germany by the more mighty reformer.

marks of his long and severe imprisonment, he had excited so deep a sympathy in many, that they were anxious to save him; and partly, they were loath to excite to a still higher degree, by this new martyrdom, the angry feelings of the Bohemians. A respite of forty days was therefore given him for reflection.[1] Let us hear how an eye-witness, a man quite destitute of susceptibility to religious impressions, one of the restorers of ancient literature, Poggio of Florence, the chosen orator of the council of Constance, expresses himself when speaking of the impression which this discourse of Jerome could not fail to make on all that heard it. He says, in a letter to his friend Aretino, or Leonard Bruno of Merezzo: "He had for three hundred and forty days[2] been pining away in a dark tower full of offensive effluvia. He had himself complained of the harsh severity of such confinement, saying that he, as became a steadfast man, did not mumur at being forced to endure such unworthy treatment, but that he could not help being astonished at the cruelty of men towards him. It was a place where he could not even see, much less read or write. I pass over the mental anguish which must have daily tortured him, and which was enough to destroy the power of memory itself within him. He cited so many learned and wise men as witnesses in behalf of his opinions, so many teachers of the church, that they would have sufficed, if he had passed the whole of this time in all quietness in the study of wisdom. His voice was pleasant, clear, full-sounding, accompanied with a certain dignity; his gestures adapted to excite indignation or pity, which, however, he neither asked for, nor sought to obtain. He stood up fearlessly, undaunted, not merely contemning death, but even demanding it, so that one might look upon him as a second Cato. O, what a man, a man worthy of everlasting remembrance!"[3] Meantime, he was visited in his prison by several of the most considerable men of the council, who hoped that he might be prevailed on to recant. Among these was Cardinal Francis Zabarella. But Jerome continued steadfast to the end.

1 It is singular that Poggio mentions only a two days' respite.

2 [We ought doubtless to read cccIx. for cccxl., though certainly it stands thus written in V. d. Hardt, iii. 69. Ed.]

3 V. d. Hardt iii. page 69.

The thirtieth of May was now appointed as the day for passing and executing the sentence on Jerome. After the bishop on whom this office was devolved by the council had made his discourse introducing the motion to pass sentence on Jerome, the latter began with a loud voice to address those who were present. He refuted what the bishop had said; protested his innocence; complained of the perversion of his language, and inveighed against the corruption of a clergy abandoned to luxury and self-enjoyment, rioting in pleasures at the expense of the poor. The sentence of the council having been pronounced on him, he was delivered over to the secular arm. He then commended himself to God, and singing psalms and hymns allowed himself to be led to the place of execution. On arriving at the spot where Huss had suffered martyrdom, and where he himself was to follow him, he fell on his knees and offered up a long and fervent prayer, so that the executioner, growing impatient, he had to be lifted up from the earth. Whilst they were fastening him with a chain to the stake, and arranging the faggots around him, he sang a spiritual song in praise of the day that brought him martyrdom. The fire being lighted behind his back, lest he might see it and be terrified, he called to the executioner to light it before his eyes, "For"—said he—"if I had been afraid of this fire, I should not have come here!" And then addressing the assembled crowd in the German language he said: "My beloved children, as I have sung, so, and no otherwise, do I believe. But the cause for which I now die is this, that I would not agree with the council in affirming[1] that Master Huss was justly condemned by them. For I had truly known him, as a genuine preacher of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." When the fire was kindled, he repeated in a loud voice, "Into thy hands, O God, I commit my spirit." And afterwards, when already suffering the deadly torture of the flames, he said, in the Bohemian language: "Lord God, have pity on me, forgive me my sins, for thou knowest I have sincerely loved thy truth." His voice could no longer be heard, but his lips appeared amidst the flames as if moving in prayer. The eye-witness, Poggio, then describes the impression

[1] Poggio, in V. d. Hardt iii. pag. 71.

which the martyrdom of Jerome made on him, though he found it impossible to comprehend what gave him the power so to die. "With cheerful looks he went readily and willingly to his death; he feared neither death, nor the fire and its torture. No stoic ever suffered death with so firm a soul, as that with which he seemed to demand it. Jerome endured the torments of the fire with more tranquillity than Socrates displayed in drinking his cup of hemlock."[1]

III. The Friends of God in Germany.

While the contests between the popes, since the time of John the Twenty-Second and the emperor Louis the Fourth, were important on account of their influence on the advancement of the church by promoting greater freedom of inquiry into ecclesiastical law and reactions against the absolute power of the popes, there were other important influences also resulting from the same causes on the movements of the religious spirit. In particular, there was partly called forth and partly promoted by these contests a religious fermentation among the German people, of which the after consequences lasted for a long time. These influences, however, we must contemplate in their connection with other disturbances in the world, and other significant appearances. Great physical and mental suffering grew out of these contests; many minds were profoundly disquieted by the interdict, the suspension of divine worship, the absence of church blessings, where the need of them was most deeply felt. Add to this the desolating effects produced by one of those pestilences often witnessed, among the signs of a time preparing by the dissolution of the old for a new creation, by virtue of an inscrutable connection between physical and spiritual development on this earth;

1 V. d. Hardt iii., pag. 70. We may also compare here the words with which another man of this period, who likewise was incapable of understanding the spirit which animated these men, Aeneas Silvio Piccolomini, expresses his admiration, when, speaking of Huss and Jerome, he says: Pertulerunt ambo constanti animo necem, et quasi ad epulas invitati ad incendium properarunt, nullam emittentes vocem, quae miseri animi facere posset indicium. Nemo philosophorum tam forti animo mortem pertulisse traditur, quam isti incendium. Histor. Bohemica, pag. 34.

between history and nature, under the guiding hand of that wise providence which makes all power subservient to one highest end. And such pestilences serve the double purpose of arousing slumbering minds to thought, and of making them conscious of their true condition. At the time of which we are speaking, all the causes above mentioned conspired together to bring the church to a consciousness of her deep corruption, to point her away from the physical to the spiritual distress, to awaken in her a remembrance of God's judgments, to direct her eye to the hidden future, leading men, with the Prophets and the Apocalypse for their guides, to study the signs of the last times. And so in fact it came about that many thought they saw very near at hand the coming of antichrist and the second advent of Christ, or a new spiritual revelation of Christ to execute judgment on a corrupt church, and prepare the way for restoring it to greater glory. Out of all this proceeded, on the one hand, divers movements of a fanatical spirit, and on the other, contemplations of a more sober and profound Christian seriousness. We are speaking of movements which continued long to propagate themselves, reaching into the fifteenth century. The prophecies of a Hildegard; the writings, genuine and spurious, of an abbot Joachim, supplied nutriment to such tendencies. The physical and spiritual sufferings of that distressful period awakened a more profound sense of religious need. In the common church theology such a need could find no satisfaction; from the common clergy, the individuals in whom this sense of need had been awakened, could expect no assistance. One peculiar characteristic for which the German race has ever been distinguished, is their profound sense of the religious element, seated in the inmost depths of the soul; their readiness to be impelled by the discordant strifes of the external world, and unfruitful human ordinances, to seek and find God in the deep recesses of their own hearts, and to experience a hidden life in God springing forth in opposition to barren conceptions of the abstract intellect that leave the heart cold and dead, a mechanism that converts religion into a mere round of outward ceremonies. John Nieder, a dominican of the fifteenth century, relates in a book of his containing many remarkable passages regarding the internal

religious life, in this and the next following times,[1] that in Germany it was a custom with men and women, not only of the lower orders but in noble families, to set apart *one* hour at least of every day to meditation on the benefits they owed to the sufferings of Christ, that they might be the better prepared for the patient endurance of trials and the exercise of all the virtues.[2] Thus arose among clergymen, monks, and laymen, of both sexes, the tendency to a mysticism that gave depth to the religious element. This tendency, which at first had developed itself in conflict with the beginnings of the scholastic theology, afterwards fell in with it, and was now beginning to shape itself in a more independent way and to gain greater influence, especially upon the popular life, in Germany. As early as the close of the thirteenth century, the way for this had already been prepared; but by the causes above mentioned it was still further promoted. Thus in the midst of this general distress and these discords of the times, we see that affiliated societies, growing out of one spirit, were formed in south and west Germany and spread as far as the Netherlands, or from the Netherlands back to Germany, having their principal seats in Strasburg, Basle, Cologne, and Nurenberg, whose members were called, both by themselves and others, *Friends of God*. Not that it was intended thereby to designate an exclusive party or sect, but simply to denote a certain stage of spiritual life, the stage of disinterested love to God; a love free from all desire of reward as the predominating affection, and opposed to a state of the affections still under bondage, where the man seeks in God something other than God himself. The Scripture which seemed to authorize this distinction and opposition between servants and friends of God, were our Saviour's words in John xv. 15, which are thus explained by one of these Friends of God, the dominican John Tauler: "Therefore did our Lord say to his disciples, 'Henceforth I call you not servants, but friends.' The 'henceforth' was from the time they forsook all and followed

1 Formicarius ed. v. d. Hardt. Hlemst. 1696.

2 Est consuetudo laudabilis multorum, ne dicam plebeorum utriusquo sexus in Alemmannia, verum etiam magnatum et nobilium, ad minus semel die naturali, hora aliqui, summum humano generi impensum beneficium, Christi passionem, meditari ac repetere, ut exinde, deo grati, mala mundi ferant patientius et virtutes operentur facilius. Pag. 133.

him; then they were his *friends* and no longer servants."[1] The same opposition is expressed again by this writer, where he distinguishes between those that carried within them the false ground, those under bondage to the world, and the true friends of God, who, without any separate will of their own, referred all things to God.[2] Men were to be found among them, who had carefully studied the scholastic theology, who occasionally display a certain refinement and subtlety of conceptual distinction, and make some use of an exact classification of the mental faculties. Such men were Tauler and Ruysbroch. But still the theology growing out of a living intercourse with God, and grounded in the internal experiences of the spiritual life, was opposed to the former and considered far superior to it. They pointed away from the strifes and contests of the scholastic theologians, which served to bewilder the mind, to those fountains of knowledge within. Thus Tauler warns against the propensity to pry into the mystery of trinity, holding that such matters should be left to the great masters at the universities; and even their disputations on these subjects he considers simply as make-shifts to dispose of the objections of heretics; not as though they could fathom the incomprehensible. "Let the great teachers study and dispute upon these matters. Yet in awkwardness of art they must still (with permission) stammer for the sake of Holy Church, looking about to see if they can possibly so express themselves as that she may not come into difficulty on account of hersey."[3] Tauler inveighs against those, "who spoil that which should be born in the spirit, by boasting of reason, whether it be doctrine, or truth, or whatever else it may be,—by pretending that they understand it, and can talk of it, and so seem to be, and are somewhat puffed up, though they bring the matter neither into life nor practice." He says: "Natural light, compared with the divine light, is less than a lighted taper to the noon-day sun."[4] Accordingly, he says of the true inward man, to which our Saviour's words, "the

1 See Schmidt, in his work, "Johannes Tauler von Strasburg," which contains so many richly instructive remarks, explanatory of the appearances we are considering. Hamburg, 1841. P. 165.

2 See the words in the Basle edition of his Sermons, of the year 1522, fol. 27 b; and in the Francfort edition of the year 1826. Vol. i., p. 263.

3 Tauler's Sermons, Bas. ed. fol. 57 b; Fr. ed. ii., p. 167.

4 Bas. ed. fol. 42 a; Fr. ed. ii., p. 101.

kingdom of God is within you," applies, that "here, these friends of God find truly and clearly the truth, which is unknown to all who do not dwell in this ground, nor keep themselves free and empty with regard to all creatures. Wherefore, beloved children, the masters of Paris diligently read the books, and turn over the leaves; this is something; this is pretty well; but *these* men read the true living book, where all is life."[1] From the number of these Friends of God came those monks and ecclesiastics who took the liveliest interest in the spiritual guidance of the laity, preached in the German language, and laboured not merely to educate the laity to orthodox thinking, to the devotional exercises of the church, to mortifications, and to various kinds of good works, but to lead them forward to a deeper experience of Christianity, to a truly divine life according to their own understanding of it. Great and striking was the difference between the common preachers who were eager to display their own acuteness and learning, who amused the people with tales and legends, warned them only against the grosser sins, and recommended almsgiving and donations to the church, and these preachers belonging to the Friends of God, who entered profoundly into the internal religious life, and sought to trace sanctification back to a hidden life in God as its inmost ground. Great and striking the difference between those who had no other object in view than to work on the imagination by descriptions of hell and of purgatory, and thus to frighten men from sin or drive them to purchase indulgences, and those men who pointed beyond fear and the hope of reward, to the love of God which could desire no higher portion than Himself! From the number of these Friends of God came those priests, who, scorning to be troubled by the common scruples during the time of the papal interdict and amidst the ravages of the Black Death, bestowed the consolations of religion on the forsaken people. They put forth from Strasburg, a letter addressed to the collective body of the clergy, arguing to show the injustice and wrong of leaving the poor ignorant people to die under the ban.[2] Thus Tauler in Strasburg, without fear of the black vomit, which carried off many of the clergy, laboured incessantly during the interdict for

1 Bas. ed. fol. 135 a; Fr. ed. iii., p. 220.

2 Schmidt, p. 52.

the welfare of the people.[1] These friends of God could pursue their work with the less opposition because they recognized in all the standing regulations of the church the divine appointment; because they followed the principle of passive obedience, where it did not directly contradict the demands of their own consciences, and strictly submitted to their ecclesiastical superiors. They recommended the conscientious discharge of all duties required by the church laws, looked upon every outward exercise of religion prescribed by the church as a preparation for a higher stage of spiritual perfection; and yet they knew how to warn men at the same time against all externalization of religion and supposed meritoriousness of good works. They pointed constantly from external things to the more hidden depths of the religious life. Thus Tauler, in a sermon where he compares many prelates of his time with blind leaders of the blind, after having spoken of the several gradations of spiritual superiors, from the pope downwards, remarks: "Were they all disposed to treat me ill, to be wolves to me, and snap at me, I am still to lay myself in true resignation and submissiveness humbly at their feet, and to do it without murmur or gainsaying."[2] The same preacher says: "Behold, for this, have all works been invented and devised, with good exercises of virtue, such as prayer, reading, singing, fasting, watching, and kneeling, and whatever other virtuous exercises there may be, that the man may be occupied therewith and kept away from foreign, unsuitable, ungodly things."[3] Know, that shouldst thou let thyself be stabbed a thousand times a day, and come to life again; shouldst thou let thyself be strung to a wheel, and eat thorns and stones; with all this, thou couldst not over-

1 So the Dominican, Heinrich von Nördlingen, expresses his joy over the great work which the Lord wrought through him in the hearts of men in the midst of wretchedness; and he remarks, that he would prefer to die by the black vomit rather to do anything against the Lord. Heumanni opuscula, Norimb. 1747, pag. 393. This person experienced persecution from the power of the emperor. He writes: "I have been before the princes of this world, who treat me so, that I no longer have any safe residence in this country." Ibid. pag. 881. Margaretha Ebnerin, of Altorf, who stood on terms of intimate connection with the Friends of God, obtained the assurance by a vision, that she should have enough in the invisible communion with Christ, even while the participation of the holy supper was denied to her through the interdict. It was said to her: Christ would comfort her with his words; and with these she should give strength to the people. Ibid. pag. 340.

2 Bas. ed. fol. 6 b; Fr. ed. i., p. 134.

3 Bas. ed. fol. 17 a; Fr. ed. i., p. 127.

come sin of thyself. But sink thyself into the deep, unfathomable mercy of God, with a humble, submissive will, under God and all creatures, and know that then alone Christ would give it thee, out of his great kindness, and free goodness, and love, and compassion."[1] We may quote the beautiful words where he describes love as a power mightier than all outward discipline to overcome the obstinate strivings of sin and sense in man. He says: "Now mark, all penance life has been devised for this purpose among other things, whether it be vigils, fasting, weeping, praying, taking discipline, hairshirts, hard beds, and whatever else, it is all for this—that body and flesh being at all times against the spirit, they are much too strong for it." These outward disciplines, therefore, he regards as a means of giving preponderance to the spirit by weakening the flesh, as he says, "and for this, that we may come to the help of the spirit in these straits, may somewhat cripple the flesh in this conflict by putting upon it the curb of penitence, and so bringing it down that the spirit may have a chance to recover itself. Then speaking of love, as a much higher power to subdue the flesh, he says: "Wouldst thou master and break it in a thousand times better way? then lay upon it the curb and fetters of love; with that thou wilt overcome it easiest of all, and with love thou wilt load it heaviest of all."[2] He characterizes reliance on one's own good works as a thing more Jewish than Christian, and says: "This Jewish way many people have; they stand upon their own ways and works; they would verily have these for their foundation; and when they have done their work, the whole is lost; yet they can neither believe God, nor any one else who tells them they are secretly building on their works and upon their own doings." And he proceeds to says, "I do not mean that we ought to omit good discipline; we should be ever exercising ourselves in it; but we should not build on it, nor rely on it." And he spoke against those who were looking for access to God by such ways as the following, "that they wore hair-shirts, and hair neckcloths, that they fasted, and watched, and prayed; that they had for forty years been poor men." And, he adds: "If you have done all the human works

[1] Bas. ed. fol. 34 a; Fr. ep. i., p. 280.
[2] Bas. ed. 14 a; Fr. ed. i., p. 159.

that have ever been done, yet of all this you shall be bare and empty in your ground as those that have done no good work, small or great, other than grace for grace and what has come from the great mercy of God, without any reservation of confidence in your own preparation."[1] Ruysbroch, speaking of the outward expression of Christian love, says: "In the showing forth of this love thou wilt observe thy good customs, at the same time also the rules of thy monastic order, good manners, good works, and all appointed and regular outward discipline, according to the commandments of God and the rules and regulations of Holy Church." "If"—says he—"thou rightly understandest the nature of love, thou wilt govern thyself, and be able easily to overcome the world, and wilt daily die to sin, and lead a life of striving after virtue." Only he requires that the soul should free itself entirely from all outward and creaturely objects, cling to them in no way; that it should freely enter into its own deepest recesses, so as to rise upward from this centre to God, in a total estrangement of this inmost centre from the world. From this centre of its being the soul should sink and lose itself in God. Strive after this alone, that thou become free from form and image, become master of thyself; so thou wilt be able as often as thou choosest to turn thy heart and eye upward, where thy treasure and thy heart are; and thou wilt preserve one life with Him. Nor wilt thou suffer the grace of God within thee to be idle, but from true love wilt exercise thyself heavenward, in praising God; below, in all forms of virtue and good actions. And, in whatever outward acts thou art employed, let thy heart be free and disengaged from all, so that as oft as thou choosest, thou mayest be able, through all and above all, to contemplate him whom thou lovest."[2] "Obedience"—he says—"makes men submissive to the commands, precepts, and will of God; subjects sense and the power of sense to the higher reason, so that the man lives becomingly and in conformity to reason. It makes him submissive also to the church, and its sacraments; to its superiors, and to all the doctrines and rules of the church."[3]

1 Bas. ed. fol. 33 b; Fr. ed. ii. pp. 59, 60.

2 Rusbroch, speculum aeternae salutis, opp. Colon. Agripp. 1692, pag. 11 (ed. ann. 1609, pag. 21).

3 De praecipuis quibusdam virtutibus, ibid. pag. 170.

Again, he says: "Show thyself willing and obedient not only to God, but also to the prelates in all good rules and exercises, which are commonly observed in holy church; and this according to the measure of thy powers and with true sobriety, as well as according to the manners and customs of the men with whom thou livest, and also of the country and district where thou dwellest."[1] He represents, it is true, the outward exercises of penance as a subordinate thing, and makes internal penitence the essential matter; but yet he holds the former to be good in its proper place, and remarks, "that we may find many, who seem to themselves accomplishing much in the way of penance, when they practise many great, severe, and outward forms of discipline, as, for instance, fastings, watchings, and other like works of penitence; which, indeed, are without doubt well-pleasing to God, and necessary for him who does the penance; yet, the truest and best penance, and that by which one gets nearest to God, is to turn, truly and from the heart, to Him, and to every virtue, for God's sake; at the same time, turning entirely away from everything known to be at variance with God, so as to feel a firm assurance in one's self that one cannot be moved, by anything that may happen to do anything of the kind, and then to have a firm confidence in the goodness of God that He will never cease to supply all needful aid."[2] Respecting fasts, he says: "Rational or spiritual works are to be preferred before barely outward works, and to be held of more account than the latter. Yet to the utmost extent of our capability, love must be maintained by good works. Christ fasted forty days. Imitate him in this, and fast in a spiritual manner, keeping thyself from all sin; and, also, to the extent of thy ability, in a bodily manner."

But although these friends of God conscientiously adhered to the forms of the church, and by their silent, unobtrusive piety, and their active charity, could hardly fail to secure the confidence and respect of the people, whose contempt the common ecclesiastics had drawn down upon themselves, still they had their opponents; partly those who were zealous to maintain the common position of the church, and whose suspicions were

[1] De septem amoris gradibus, pag. 221.
[2] De praec. quibusd. virt., pag. 185.

excited by that more liberal spirit of the Friends of God which shone so conspicuously through their conscientious attachment to the church; partly the advocates of a secularized Christianity, who felt themselves annoyed by the more serious Christian life of the Friends of God. Accordingly they were nick-named after the common fashion in that age of applying some opprobrious epithet to those who, for one reason or another, were looked upon as enthusiasts or pietists; they were called Beghards—people who prayed much. John Ruysbroch says: "Though the *servant* of the Lord shows himself faithful in outward exercises and works, yet he has no experience of that which the *secret friends* of God *feel*. And this is the reason why such inexperienced and outward men find fault with those who apply themselves to the internal exercises. They suppose that such persons are wholly idle; like Martha, who complained to the Lord of her sister, that she paid him no attention."[1] And Tauler, speaking of those among the Jews who were hostile to Christ as if they had hearts of stone, says: "Alas! why should it be, that we still find Christian men who, when they see God's friends in good ways, in good works, immediately harbour ill-will towards them, become at heart bitterly opposed to them, count as nothing their works which they do, and their ways and their life, and invent such glosses about them or against them as to prove themselves to be just like those bad Jews."[2] In a noticeable passage Tauler speaks against a certain class, whom he thus characterizes: "the poor blind people think that the precious sufferings of our Lord Christ were to pass off in sport and without fruit. Their reliance is this, that they stand in fraternity with some spiritual order (the fratres adscripti), that they pray and read; nay"—says he—"thou doest all this without love and without devotion, with a distracted heart, so blindly and coldly, that it is a wonder to think of it." He then says: They confessed in words, but not with the whole will and from the bottom of the heart: they received the Lord's body; but it was very much as if one should invite a king into his house and then place him in an unclean, offensive stall among the swine. It were a thousand times better for them, if they never received it.

[1] De calculo, pag. 825.

[2] Bas. ed. fol. 32 b; Fr. ed. ii., p. 57.

And if any one took pains to warn them of the danger of their position, they laughed at him and said: "It is all Beghards' talk, or nun's twaddle."[1] These Friends of God exercised a great influence over the laity, not only by their preaching and attention to common pastoral duties, but it was a part of the system for those among the laity who longed after that higher stage of Christian life set forth by the Friends of God in their sermons, to surrender themselves entirely up to some individual as their confessor and guide in the spiritual life, and follow his instructions as if it were a voice from heaven. This was simply carrying out the doctrine of those mystics who taught that it was a duty to follow implicitly the guidance of those who were recognized as organs of God. And unquestionably in these times, when the deep-felt and oftentimes wrongly interpreted sense of religious need, the high state of religious excitement in connection with the low state of Christian knowledge, exposed men to dangerous temptations, and the more as their aspirations rose higher; when, by abandoning themselves to their feelings, they would be very likely to fall into dangerous extravagances, earnest, inquiring, but ignorant minds, did greatly need the guidance of some prudent individual, experienced in the trials and conflicts of the spiritual life. Well then might Tauler, after describing the dangers which beset him who strove after such an object, add: "Therefore the safer course for those who would fain live for the truth, is to have a friend of God, and submit to be guided by him according to God's Spirit. Eighty miles or more would not be too far to go in search of a friend of God who knew the right way and could direct them in it."[2] And in another sermon, where he labours to show how difficult it is to attain true renunciation of one's self and of natural things and to betake one's self solely to God in the inmost depths of the spirit, he says: "Therefore entreat the beloved friends of God that they would assist you in it, and then give your whole self simply and solely to God and to the chosen friends of God, that they may carry you along to God with themselves."[3] In some such

1 Bas. ed. fol. 77 a; Fr. ed. ii., p. 235. [The Francf. ed. which in general is quite incorrect in its text, has, instead of Begharden, "Bejahrte." Ed.]

2 Bas. ed. fol. 146 b; Fr. ed. iii. p. 122.

3 Bas. ed. fol. 28 b; Fr. ed. i. p. 265.

relation to Tauler stood a remarkable man, afterward a zealous member of the party of the Friends of God, Rulmann Merswin of Strasburg. This person, who belonged to one of the most respectable families of that city, was a rich broker and merchant. In his fortieth year (1347), after losing his first wife, he contracted a second marriage, and having no issue by either, he with the concurrence of his second wife resolved to retire wholly from the world. He applied his great wealth to no other purpose than that of founding institutions of Christian charity. He had much to struggle with in endeavouring to attain to a godly life, being too much governed by his momentary feelings. The natural and the divine element were strangely mixed up together in his character. He easily brought himself to believe that certain visions, the product of his own highly excited feelings and heated imagination, were divine revelations. The excessive mortifications which he imposed on himself impaired his health, and the morbid affections which he thus contracted may perhaps have exerted some disturbing influence both on his feelings and on his intellect. Tauler, who, as we have seen, disapproved of this mode of crucifying the flesh, being chosen by this man as his guide, bade him, as a friend of God, to desist from these immoderate self-tortures, and not destroy his health; for he was extremely anxious lest, by the course he was now pursuing, he might suddenly become insane. Merswin, as he informs us himself, thought it his duty to obey.[1] In the year 1353 he composed, in the German language, a widely circulated eccentric mystical work, under the impulse, as he believed, of a divine call, containing many strange and fanciful notions mixed up with a good deal that is true. It was entitled the *Book of the Nine Rocks*. This work was included, though not in its complete form, among the works of Henry Suso, and ascribed to him as the author.[2]

1 We quote from the above-mentioned excellent work of Prof. Schmidt, of Strasburg, to whom we are indebted for an account of this man, eminently characteristic of the times in which he lived, Merswin's own words on the subject: Und in denselben ziten was bruoder Johans tauweler der brediger min bichter. Der befant ettewas minre uebungen, wanne er nam es ware das ich gar krang in der natuoren geriet werden. Und er vorhte mins houbetes und gebot mir bi gehorsamme das ich mich in keinre uebungen solte me ueben, und mahte mir daran ein zil, und ich muste gehorsam sin. Schmidt, p. 178 note.

2 That the work, however, is not to be ascribed to him, but to Merswin, has been proved on documentary evidence by Prof. Schmidt, in his work above cited, p. 180. Compare also Illgen's Zeitschrift für historische Theologie. 1839, Heft. 2, p. 61.

With great freedom he here describes the corruption of the church through all its orders, from highest to lowest. He says of the popes: "Look around and mark how the popes in these times live and have lived, whether they have not had more regard for themselves, more concern to know how they shall maintain their own state, than how the glory of God may be promoted? And look around and see whether they do not court temporal possessions with a view to advance the interests of their temporal friends, and help on their promotion to temporal honours."[1] It is deserving of notice that this man was led, by the more liberal character of his mysticism, to question in this book the doctrine that all unbelievers are lost; maintaining that, among the Jews, Turks, and pagans, were many men of good life, who would, before their end, be led by a particular inward revelation to the knowledge of a Saviour and to faith in him; and that we shall meet many such in the world to come.[2] We see by the example of this individual, how laymen as well as clergymen might be enrolled among the Friends of God; and in the case of the former, who were not so strictly educated in the theology of the schools, we see how it might sometimes happen that they would be led, by this freer tendency of the religious spirit, without being conscious of it or intending it, into many unchurchly convictions, and how this might become a channel through which the influence of unchurchly tendencies might be introduced among the Friends of God generally. We cannot be surprised at the fact, therefore, that among the Friends of God there were many sectional differences, from a more strict churchly direction to a tendency bordering on the heretical, or entirely heretical.

The position maintained by those Friends of God, whose inward Christianity made them more free from the influence of the hierarchical spirit, is characteristically presented before us, when we see a priest of the Dominican order, and a famous preacher, placing himself in the relation we have described to a layman who appeared to him more advanced than himself in holy living, and making that layman his guide in the spiritual

1 Schmidt, p. 216.

2 The same, p. 219. This portion is not included in the writings published under the name of Suso.

life. We meet with an ancient account[1] of a layman living 120 miles from the city of Strasburg, who, by a divine call in a thrice repeated vision, was conducted, in the year 1340, to Tauler, then already a preacher of note. In his first interview he requested the latter to preach before him a discourse on the way to Christian perfection. The sermon did not produce the effect which Tauler expected; and the stranger afterwards explained to him that he had not come to learn from him how to attain to the most perfect life, but with the intention and hope of doing him some good. He then proceeded to speak of that internal master, respecting whom Tauler himself had spoken in his sermon. "Know," said he, "that when this same master comes to me, he teaches me more in an hour, than you, and all the teachers who are of time, could teach me if they went on to the last day." And he assured Tauler to his great amazement, that he must consider him a mere man of books and a pharisee. The pious gentle preacher did not let himself grow angry at such language from a layman addressed to a priest and doctor of theology, but instead of disdainfully turning away from him, calmly listened to all he had to say. The layman went on to distinguish two different sorts of pharisees, the malignant and the well-intentioned; those whose doctrines and life, though they were unconscious of it themselves, did not perfectly harmonize; whose preaching consisted more of the letter and of rational knowledge, than of the truth contained in the life and internal experience of the heart; who, though they knew how to discourse finely of pure love to God, and of communion with him, were still entangled in creaturely love, without any true experience as yet of vital communion of the heart with God. Tauler felt himself touched to the quick by many things which the stranger said. He chose him as the friend of God who was to be his guide; got him to prescribe the way to a new spiritual development; retired for a season from his labours in the pulpit; but on returning to his duties found himself so overcome and unmanned by his feelings, as to be unable to utter a word. The preacher who was before so famous, was now laughed at. But afterwards, when he had fully recovered himself, he stood forth

[1] In the Hist. Tauleri in the Bas. edition, before the Sermons.

with fresh energy and laboured more abundantly than ever. This story, no better authenticated, might be regarded by many as a figment of legendary tradition, a pure fabrication, or an intermixture of poetry and historical truth.[1] But we have, in this case, at least one example which might teach a lesson of caution to those who would banish from history everything that looks like poetry, and retain the trivial only as matter of historical fact. This story has very recently become established as matter of history on the ground of authentic record.[2] And we obtain a more familiar acquaintance with the man as an historical personage, who came, according to the legend, from a town 120 miles from Strasburg. He was a person of great influence in that period, named *Nicholas* of *Basle*. He then belonged to the Waldensian sect, the members of which would, for the reasons already hinted at, be very likely to find in the more liberal Christian tendencies of the Friends of God scattered about in that district, many points of mutual agreement. But it may be commonly remarked that when a determinate spiritual tendency becomes predominant in any period or district, it is wont to impart something of its own peculiar stamp to other spiritual appearances that may happen to possess anything in common with itself, though the two may in other respects differ entirely in character, just as in the physical world a prevailing epidemic will make other forms of disease run into its own form. Thus the Waldensians in the district of the Rhine did not at that time remain wholly true to their original direction, since this at the outset was a more simply practical one. The predominant spirit of mysticism communicated itself also to them; and there grew up a section of Waldensian Friends of God, which, paying less homage than the others did to the church spirit, developed itself with greater freedom of doctrine in opposition to the dominant church. To this party belonged Nicholas, a man who by oral discourses and writings in the Latin and German languages laboured to introduce a more experimental Christianity, and exerted a great and widely extended influence. At Basle he

1 This story, as is well known, has been worked up into a book of great poetic beauty, by Tieck, in his novel "der Schutzgeist."

2 By the investigations of Schmidt, in his work before cited, p. 25, note 5.

had heard much about the piety and influence of Tauler.[1] But from his Waldensian point of view he might probably be led to conjecture that this famous preacher was after all wanting in true freedom of Christian spirit; and from what he had heard of his pious, humble character, he might perhaps hope to succeed in exercising a wholesome influence on the Christian knowledge and the Christian life of the man. It may well be doubted, indeed, whether Nicholas, who, with a view to extend the sphere of his usefulness in promoting the religious life, rarely mentioned his own anti-churchly tendencies, would say anything to Tauler about his connection with the Waldensians; still it is impossible to know how much confidential intercommunication may have taken place between the two men. And Tauler as long as he lived continued to maintain the most intimate and friendly relations with this layman. This Nicholas of Basle was, as we have said, extremely cautious in disseminating his principles. He laid himself out to work on the minds of the people more particularly by writings in the German language. In a tract composed in the year 1356, he defended the circulation of German writings among the laity against the doubts entertained by many of its expediency. He speaks on this matter also with great moderation. He allows that such doubts were, in some respects, well founded; in respect to writings, namely, which required many explanations in order to be rightly understood, and which therefore by being misapprehended might easily lead to error. Such writing belonged exclusively to the priests, and should not be translated into German. But the case stood otherwise with simple, practical, and plainly composed Christian writings, suited to the understanding and wants of the laity. He says, "those book-learned men, who would keep the laity from reading these, sought their own glory more than the glory of God." "But," he adds, "where you find teachers, who have no eye to themselves, you should gladly hear them; for whatever such teachers counsel, comes from the Holy Spirit." He says Christian order can never be restored, till men follow the counsel which comes from the Holy Spirit; and such cannot be at vari-

[1] We see from Schmidt's quotation p. 29 note, that in a Munich manuscript in the account of Tauler, the words of this unknown layman are found, which are wanting in the printed editions: "Wan mir vil von euer ler daheim ist gesagt."

ance with Holy Scripture, for Holy Scripture and the Holy Spirit are one. "If," he adds, "a great lord of this world, or a whole district or city should ask me how, as things now stand, men may return to God, and find reconciliation with him, I would advise that they should seek that counsel which comes from the Holy Spirit, whether such counsel proceed from priest or layman."[1] In all this we may easily recognize the general drift and tendency above described, though there is an attempt to conceal it. We recognize a man who estimated the inward voice of the spirit above all outward authority, and who certainly therefore could not be inclined to pay that authority the same submissive homage with other Friends of God. The mystical bent may undoubtedly have led many to entertain very free opinions respecting the apostles, whose characters they would estimate according to their own peculiar principles of Christian perfection. It would not be strange in such persons to accuse an apostle Paul of boasting too much of his own labours. But Nicholas was widely removed from all this. He says of such, "Mark, my beloved brethren, how some men are scandalized at the words of holy Paul, who was a bright shining light, a full vessel overflowing with lovely humility." All that he said to his brethren, or wrote to them, was suited to the times when Christianity began; and there was need of it too. He wrote from divine love, and never had an eye to himself: in all things he had a single eye to the glory of God. And I believe if the words addressed to John the Baptist had been spoken to the apostle Paul, he would in like manner have answered, "I am not worthy to unloose his shoe's latchet."[2] This Nicholas, directly or indirectly, exerted a great influence, as a guide and counsellor in the spiritual life, on many who never had the remotest suspicion of his heretical tendencies. But he could not always succeed in escaping the suspicion of the head of the church; and from some hints which he drops we may understand the perilous situation in which these more free-minded Friends of God sometimes found themselves placed. He writes: "Ah, beloved brethren, may God in his infinite goodness, in

[1] Schmidt, p. 231.

[2] In a letter to the Strasburg Johannites, in the year 1377, Schmidt, p. 234.

this present time of Christianity, have pity. For know, the Friends of God are in a great strait. But what is to come of it, they know not, God only knows."[1] Having succeeded through a long life in escaping the snares of the inquisition,[2] he undertook when very old, in company with two of his disciples, to make a journey to France, where probably he was in the habit of going to disseminate his doctrines. At Vienna, he was arrested by the inquisition, together with one of his disciples; and as nothing could induce him to consent to a recantation, he was handed over, as an heretical Beghard, to the civil authorities, and died at the stake.

The highest regions of the interior life in souls where impure elements rule, are exposed to the most dangerous perturbations; the deepest truths of religion, when they are not purely apprehended, may intermingle indistinguishably with the most dangerous misconceptions. It is often but a very thin and subtle line, which separates truth from error. Thus the doctrine of these Friends of God respecting man's ability and duty to go back to the deepest grounds of his being; respecting an inward concentration of the mind withdrawn from every thing creaturely; utter renunciation of self, and absorption in God, was liable to pass over into very serious errors. Where the longing for union with God was not ever accompanied side by side with a consciousness of the self-subsistence of the creaturely spirit, and the infinite exaltation of God above the world, with a consciousness of sin standing in contrariety with the holiness of God, with a humility never forgetting for a moment the strict line that separates the creature from the Creator, the sobriety and modesty of true humility; where an unbridled imagination, a speculative spirit ignorant of its proper limits, where the intoxication of a soul governed entirely by its feelings, intermingled with the natural and the divine, and took complete possession of the man; in a word, where the mind, instead of holding fast to God revealed in Christ, would sink itself, without any mediation, in the unfathomable abyss of God unrevealed; in all these

1 The same, p. 235.

2 The Dominican John Nieder, of Suabia, says of him in his book, already mentioned, Formicarius, pag. 304: Acutissimus enim erat et verbis errores coloratissime velare noverat. Idcirco etiam manus inquisitorum diu evaserat et multo tempore.

cases and the like, they who knew not how to guard against such dangers, by strict watchfulness over themselves, plunged into the gulf of pantheistic self-deification. Thus arose that wildly fanatical pantheistic mysticism, which was for getting beyond Christ, beyond all positive revelation, all humanization of the divine, as we see it exemplified particularly among a portion of the so-called Beghards, of whom we shall say more hereafter, as well as among the so-called Brothers and Sisters of the Free Spirit,—a community already characterized by their name, the advocates of that false liberty, grounded in pantheism, which scorned all the settled landmarks of holy order. The opposition is strongly marked between the theistic Friends of God of whom we have thus far been speaking, and the pantheistic class. While in the former we may see foretokens of a direction which led to the Reformation; in the latter we see, no less clearly, the foretokens of a thoroughly antichristian tendency, hostile to everything supernatural, every intimation of a God above the world; a tendency which contained, first in the form of mysticism, the germ of absolute Rationalism and the deification of reason,—a tendency which, after many attempts, often repelled and continually renewed, was eventually to appear in a contest for life and death with Christianity itself. As the theistic element distinguished the first class of the Friends of God from the second, so was it also a distinguishing mark between the two classes, that by the first it was held necessary to unite the contemplative with the practical life, the intuitive absorption in God with active love; while by the others, on the contrary, a pantheistic quietism that despised all active labour, was extolled as the highest perfection. A sharply defined boundary may, indeed, be observed between these two ground-tendencies, wherever they are fully and consciously expressed; but these tendencies did not always so exhibit themselves as to be easily distinguished. Many, by pushing the above mentioned ground-intuitions and tendencies of the religious life into an extreme, by running into a sort of speculation which was mixed up with the feelings, and failed of paying due respect to the proper limits of all speculation, by a certain intoxication of self-forgetting love that discarded calm reflection, were unconsciously betrayed into effusions and expressions upon which that wild fanatical pantheism might afterwards

seize and fasten itself. We reckon among such that Master Eckhart, of the Dominican order, whom Tauler mentions as his teacher. This person, a Saxon by origin, stood in high estimation with his order, having been made first provincial of the Dominican order for Saxony, in the year 1304, when it was found expedient, on account of the extent of territory, to separate this part of the order from that belonging to the rest of Germany and constitute it a province by itself.[1] We may mention in particular, for an example, that passage of Eckhart, where he describes God's essence as being the darkness from which all things sprung, and to which they are to return: "Verily God himself rests not there where he is the first beginning; he rests there where he is an end and a rest of all being. Not that this being comes to nothing, but it is there completed in its ultimate end according to its highest perfection. What is this ultimate end? It is the hidden darkness of the eternal Godhead, and is unknown, and will never be known. God there remains unknown to himself; and the light of the Eternal Father, this has eternally shone in there, and the darkness comprehendeth not the light."[2] For another example, take his words on the Logos: "That is no longer an essence, then, which gives all things an essence and life, when the Son is generated from the heart of the Father, eternally to bring in again all things which in him have gone forth." He cites, as referring to this, the words of Christ: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me," and then adds: "The Holy Spirit proceeds forth as a love to make our spirit one with him. Therefore the Son brings in again with him all things which in him have gone forth. And therefore the Holy Spirit comes in again with all that which he has spiritualized."[3] Eckhart defines as true righteousness those works only which proceed, without reflection, from the inward constraining influence of the divine life. "The just man"—he says—"searches not into his own works. For they who seek for anything in their own works, are all servants and hirelings; or they who work for some wherefore,

1 Quetif et Echard script. ord. praedic., Paris 1719, tom. i. fol. 507, vi.

2 Eckhart's Sermons, in an appendix to the Hamburg edition (1621) of Tauler's Sermons, p. 23.

3 The same, p. 10.

whether it be blessedness or eternal life, or the kingdom of heaven, or whatever else in time or in eternity, all such are not righteous. For righteousness consists in this, that a man work without respect to a *wherefore*. And hence, if thou wouldst be *in*formed or *over*-formed in righteousness, think not of thy works, nor image to thyself any wherefore, either in time or in eternity, either reward or blessedness, either this thing or that thing. For all the works thou performest from the movement of the imagination, or out of the imagination, verily *these* works are all dead. Nay, may I say it? but I will say it, and it is this: that if thou dost image to thyself even God, whatever thou doest from respect *to this*, I speak truly, thy works are all dead; they are faults, they are nothing, and they are not barely nothing, but thou destroyest by them even the works that are good."[1] We may mention, furthermore, that proposition, so variously abused by fanatical pantheism, that all which God works, man works with him. Accordingly he asserts, that the good works which a man performs while in mortal sin, are not on that account lost; evil and good works, *in themselves considered*, and the time in which they are done, are all lost; they have no abiding permanence except on the ground of the spirit from which they proceed, and from this ground come the good works also which may be done in mortal sin, and not from the man who is in this mortal sin.[2] There were extracted from Eckhart's writings and sermons twenty-six propositions connected with the pantheistic mode of thinking, or verging upon such a mode of thinking, which found their common point of union in assertions similar to those above quoted; and these were formerly condemned. But as Eckhart gave up to this decision, retracting those propositions in every sense in which they were found heretical or scandalous, and in general submitted himself to be corrected by the pope and the church, no further steps were taken against him personally,

1 The same, p. 4.

2 His own words are: So then labour and time are lost together; bad and good they are all lost at once, if they have no abiding in the spirit, and no being nor place in themselves. If the man does good works, whilst he is in mortal sin, yet he does not the works of mortal sin; if the works are good, the mortal sins are evil. He works them out of the ground of his spirit, which, in itself, is naturally good; but *he* is not in grace. In a Sermon in Mone's "Anzeiger für Kunde der teutschen Vorzeit." Jahrgang 1837, p. 72.

and he was permitted to end his days in peace. But when it was found that similar doctrines were widely disseminated among mystical societies, pope John XXII. put forth, in the year 1329, a bull complaining with justice that such doctrines were held forth in sermons to the simple people.[1] Yet in vindication of the memory of the departed Eckhart, he immediately subjoined what has been stated above. We may here quote a few of the most remarkable of these propositions. It was asserted that God and the world are correlative conceptions, and that it may be said God created the world from eternity;[2] that in all works, good as well as evil, in their guilt and their punishment, God is in like manner manifested and glorified; that he who prays for this or that particular thing, prays for what is bad in a bad way, because he prays for a negation of the good and a negation of God, and prays that God may be denied to him. In those who *seek* for nothing, neither honour, nor profit, nor devotion, nor holiness, nor reward, nor kingdom of heaven, but have renounced all, even that which is their own, in such God is glorified. We are transformed wholly into God, and transformed into him in the same way as, in the sacrament, the bread is transformed into the body of Christ. I become thus transformed into him, because it is he himself who brings it about that I am his. All that the Father gave to his Son when born into human nature, all this he has given to me; I except nothing here, neither unity nor holiness; but he has given all to me as to himself. All that the holy Scriptures say of Christ, is true also of every good and godlike man. Everything that belongs to the divine essence, belongs also to the godly and righteous man; therefore such a person does all that God does, and with God created the heavens and the earth, and is a begetter of the eternal Word, and God can do nothing without such a person. The good man must make his own will so identical with God's will as to will all that God wills; because God, in a certain sense, wills that I should have sinned, I ought not to wish that I had not sinned. God has not, strictly speaking, laid down rules for outward action.

1 Quae docuit quam maxime coram vulgo simplici in suis praedicationibus. Comp. Raynaldi Ann. at the year 1329, no. 70 and 71.

2 Interrogatus quandoque, quare deus mundum non prius produxerit, respondit tunc, sicut nunc, quod deus non potuit primo producere mundum, quia res non potest agere antequam sit, unde quam cito deus fuit, tam cito mundum creavit; item concedi potest, mundum fuisse ab aeterno. Ibid.

All creatures are purely nothing; I say not that they are something, but purely nothing. There is in the soul something uncreated, and exalted above all that is created; if the whole soul were this, it would be itself uncreated, and exalted above all that is created; and this is *spirit*. God is neither good, nor the best; it is just as incorrect to call him so, as to call him black or white.[1]

We may now consider how Ruysbroch and Tauler contended against the pantheistic and quietistic views, the mistaken strivings after freedom, which appeared in the forms we have described. The former says:[2] "We may meet with godless and devilish men, who affirm that they are God or Christ, and that their hands created heaven and earth, and on their hands all these things depend; and that they are above all sacraments of the church, that they need them not, and wish them not. The ordinances of the church and what the holy fathers have recorded on parchment, they despise; but their own godless heresy, and a life which is bound by no ordinances or institutions, and the beastly customs invented by themselves, they hold to be very holy and excellent. And yet they have banished from themselves the love and fear of God; and they disdain the knowledge of good and evil. But they have found within themselves something transcendent, above reason; and they have wholly drunk in the opinion, that on the day of final judgment all rational creatures, evil as well as good, angels and bad spirits, will pass over into a certain essence, transcending representation, and that this essence is God, in its nature blessed, but without knowledge or will. Since the beginning of time, there has never been invented a more senseless or perverse opinion than this. And yet many suffer themselves to be deceived by it, even of such as seem to be spiritually-minded, when in fact they are worse than the demons themselves. For what they affirm is contradicted by pagans and by Jews, by nature, law, reason, all that Scripture teaches concerning good and bad angels." Ruysbroch next proceeds to distinguish between the ideal and the real being of

1 This translation does not correspond, it is true, to the Latin words: Ac si ego album vocarem nigrum; but I conjecture from the sense that it should properly read: album vocarem aut nigrum.

2 Speculum aeternae salutis. Opp. p. 27 (ed. 1609, pag. 50).

rational creatures. "The life"—says he—"that we, in the divine idea, have in God, is one with himself, and in its own nature a blessed one. But besides this, we have another in common with the angels; a life created by God from nothing; one which will always endure; and such an one cannot be a blessed one in its own nature; but it can become a blessed one by God's grace, if we attain to grace; that is, to faith, hope, knowledge, and love. If we attain to these, we practise those virtues which are pleasing to God, and thus rise above ourselves, and become united with God; yet a creature never becomes God." "We may meet with many"—says he in another place[1]—"who imagine they have experienced within themselves a certain true life, above all practice of virtue; and that they have combined a created and uncreated life, God and the creature at once; with regard to all which we should know that we have a certain eternal life in the original type of the divine wisdom. And this life ever abides in the Father, and proceeds forth from Him with the Son, and flows back into the same essence with the Holy Spirit; and thus we live in an eternal manner in the original type of the holy trinity and of the unity of the Father." But from this he distinguishes the created life, "which springs from the same wisdom in which God knows his power, wisdom, and goodness; and this is the image or copy of the former, by which the former lives in us. By virtue of this image of the former, our life has three properties, whereby we resemble that original type. For our essence ever contemplates the original of our uncreated essence, lives in it, and feels drawn towards it, where we live from God, live to God, live in God, and God in us. This, then, he regards as the hidden, primordial ground of creaturely spirits, whereby they are united in connection with that architypal being to God. "This"—he says—"is the true ground of life, and is in us all, as to essence, by virtue of mere nature. For it is exalted above hope, faith, grace, and all exercises of virtue, and therefore its being, life, and action are one. But this life is hidden in God and in the essence of our souls. And because this dwells in us all by nature, so, many may, in a certain way, even without grace or faith, and without any exercise of virtue whatever, come to some knowledge of it by natural reason." Ac-

1 Ibid. pag. 29.

cordingly, he now proceeds to trace the misconceptions of those panthesists to their one-sided mode of apprehending that hidden primordial ground separate from the supernatural light of grace. "There are"—says he—"men given to idle reverie, with introverted eyes, turned away from sensible images to their own simple essence; and when so turned they deem themselves blessed, holy; some even look upon themselves as very God. And they care about nothing, be it good or evil, if they can but rid themselves of forms and images, and find and possess themselves in the pure repose of their essence." So after speaking of the above distinction between the ideal and the real being of the creaturely spirit, he says:[1] "And yet we are not the wisdom of God; for then we should have created ourselves, which is impossible; and to believe this, is godless and heretical. For all that we are and have, we have from God and not from ourselves." Again, he says:[2] "In communion with God we are one spirit and one life with him; but still we continue to be creatures. For though we have been transfigured by his light, and absorbed by his love, yet we still know and feel that we are something other than and different from Him. Hence it is that we feel ourselves constrained ever to look up to him and to strive towards him; and this act will abide eternally with us. For never will it be in our power to lose our created essence and so purely to pass out from it that we shall not still, and through all eternity, continue to be something different from God. For though the Son of God partook of our nature, yet he by no means made us God." How personal consciousness still continues even at the highest point reached by contemplation, in soaring upward to God, he shows thus:[3] "Though we may rise above reason, still we are not without reason; hence we feel that we touch and are touched; love and are beloved; we are continually renewed, and return back into ourselves; we go and return, like lightning. For by love we contend and brace ourselves, as if stemming a torrent, because we have not power to press through and pass beyond the creaturely essence." "Although"—says he in another place[4]—"love absorbs the soul, consumes it, and even demands of it what is impossible, and although the soul longs to resolve itself into love as into nothing, yet it can never perish but will

[1] Ibid. p. 31. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. pag. 34.

always endure. I would, however"—says he[1]—"call to the reader's recollection that, where it was asserted by me that we are one with God, it is to be understood that we are one with him in love, not in nature and essence. For God's essence is uncreated, but ours is created; which makes an infinite difference. Hence, we may indeed be united one with the other, but never become one. And if our own essence were annihilated, we could neither know, nor love, nor be blessed." And again, in the remarkable passage[2] where he ascribes the fall of the angels to their falling in love with their own nature, and thinking they did not need the supernatural gifts of God, he adds: "And yet still worse than all evil spirits are those hypocritical men who despise God, and his gifts, and Holy Church and all her sacraments, and Holy Scripture, and all exercises of virtue, and say they lead a life exalted above every other kind, something quite transcendent, and that they have sunk themselves into the same repose as they had before they were created, and that they have no knowledge, no love, no will, no craving, no exercises of virtue, but are rid of them all. And because they would sin, and commit foul crimes without compunction of conscience, they say besides, that in the day of judgment good and evil spirits, godless and pious men will all be transformed together into the simple essence of God; and then all would in this enjoy an essential blessedness, without knowledge or love of God; and then God would neither know nor love himself nor any creature." Furthermore, we should here give prominent place to that profoundly thoughtful, truthful description of a one-sided intellectualized mysticism, divorced of all vitality of feeling, where he says:[3] "The most dangerous temptation besets those who, without exercise of the virtues, find within themselves, by imageless, naked intelligence, the essential being of their souls, and possess the same in a certain naked repose of their spirit and their nature. These sink into a certain empty and blind repose of their essence; they do not concern themselves in the least about performing good works and exercises, external or internal; and all internal acts, as willing, knowing, loving, longing, and all active tendency to God, they despise and spurn. If these had but striven for one short hour of

1 Ibid. 2 Ibid. pag. 27.

3 De quatuor subtilib, tentationib, pag. 196. (ed. 1609, pag. 360).

their life, with pure love and a holy disposition after God, and had a taste of the true virtues, they could never have fallen into this blindness and into this unbelief. Assuredly our Lord and Saviour Christ himself, all classes of the blessed spirits, and holy men, will, through all eternity, act, love, long, thank, praise, have will and consciousness; nor can they, without these acts, be blessed. God himself, if he did not act, would not be God, and could not be blessed. Grievously, therefore, do they err, these poor men, who are to be mourned over with many tears, who slumber and sink down in this mistaken repose of their souls. . . . . Hence comes a perverted freedom. They are simple people, without all practice of the virtues, and who remain at a very far remove from any true mortification of their nature. Or if they have sought long and much to exercise themselves in great penitence, still they have done it without love and without a pure disposition towards God." Perhaps we may infer from these last words, that many who had taken great pains in the practice of self-mortification, afterwards fell away into this mystic bent of apathy. "It is the manner of this people"—says he—"to sit quiet in one spot, with no sort of occupation, retiring into themselves with an idle sensuousness, stript bare of all images. And because they are without the practice of the virtues, and without love through union with God, hence they do not penetrate into themselves, but reposing in their own essence, convert this into their god or idol. Meanwhile, they fancy themselves one with God." "Thus we are"—says he in another place[1]—"without any mediation, in a way exalted above all the virtues, united with God, where, in the highest point of our created essence, we bear his image within us; still, we ever continue to be like him, and united with him in ourselves, through his grace and by our virtuous life." He says[2]—"We may find a certain race of hypocrites. They would be regarded as persons standing in a passive relation to God; they would be inactive, and merely certain instruments of God. They affirm, therefore, that they stand only in a passive relation, without any action of their own; and those works which God produces in them as his blind instruments, are more excellent and possessed of greater merit than the works of

[1] Lib. de septem amoris gradib., pag. 224.
[2] De ornatu spirital. nuptiar., pag. 275.

other men. They affirm that they are incapable of committing sin, because God alone works all things in them, and only what God wills and nothing else is done by them. They imagine that every thing to which they feel inwardly impelled, whether it be in agreement with virtue or opposed to it, proceeds from the motions of the Holy Spirit." From this class Ruysbroch distinguishes another as a still worse one, who pushed this pantheistic quietism to such an extreme as to believe themselves not only raised by it above all religious rites, all the ordinances of the church, all obedience to the church, in their own imagined perfection, their denudation from all creaturely properties and their absorption into God, but also empowered by it to annul all distinctions of right and wrong, and justify every species of irregularity, provided no disturbance were offered to the repose of the spirit. We are reminded by all this of similar phenomena, which have occurred among many Gnostic sects and in ancient India. He tells us first in what respects they agreed with those before mentioned: "They sit still and idle, without any exertion of virtue or good works; and this to such extent as that they will neither praise God, nor thank him; nor know, will, or love him, nor pray to him or long after him. They imagine that they already possess everything which they could pray for; and that they are already poor in spirit, as they are without will of their own, and have renounced everything, and live without any choice or purpose of their own. They imagine they are rid of everything and superior to everything. They have already attained to all for which the various institutions and rites of the church have been founded. As they themselves pretend, no being, not even God, can give anything to them, or take aught from them. For according to their own judgment they are beyond all exercises, all rites of worship, and all the virtues, and have attained to a certain pure repose, where they are free from all the virtues. And they say, that to be thus free in repose from the virtues, requires greater pains and exertions than to attain to the virtues themselves. For this reason they would enjoy freedom, obey nobody, neither pope, nor bishops, nor prelates. And though they put on outwardly the mask of a certain obedience, yet inwardly they are subject to no one, neither in will nor in action. For from all which Holy Church does and observes, from all this

they hold themselves exempted, and will have nothing to do with it. And this is their opinion—so long as a man takes pains to acquire virtues, and seeks to fulfil the will of God, he is not perfect; since he is still seeking to acquire virtues, and has learnt nothing as yet of this his spiritual poverty. And they consider themselves exalted above all the orders of the world of spirits and all the hosts of the saints, and every reward which could possibly be merited; and, therefore, they suppose that they can merit nothing more, they can make no farther progress in virtue, nor commit any more sins, since they are without will of their own, and have surrendered their spirits to God in repose, and hence have so become one with God as to be altogether nothing in themselves. Therefore, they affirm, every thing is allowable to them which their bodies may lust after, since reduced back to the state of innocence they have no law prescribed to them. Therefore, when their corporeal nature lusts after anything, whatever it may be, and they feel that the tranquillity of their spirits is disturbed by the non-gratification of this desire, they give up to their nature. Therefore they give themselves no concern about observing fasts or festivals, except when, for men's sake, they do otherwise. For in all things they live without conscience, holding that there is nothing which is not permitted them." "I hope"—says he—"that we shall find but few of this sort of men; but they, whoever they are, that belong to their number, are the worst of men; and seldom, if ever, do they come to their senses; in the mean time, evil spirits get possession of them." He says, that they were hard to be reached by arguments. And Tauler, after pointing out how the contemplative life should pass over into the active—both being in essence one—contends against these advocates of a one-sided, contemplative bent. "There are, again"—says he[1]—"certain men who set value only on contemplation, and set no value on reality, and say that they need not exercise, need not virtue; they have passed beyond it." And he holds up to such the words of Christ respecting the seed cast into good ground, which brought forth a hundred fold; and Matth. iii. 10.

Having thus explained this general opposition of the ground-tendencies of the so-called Friends of God, we will proceed to

1 Bas. ed. fol. 15 b; Fr. ed. i. p. 123.

enter more at large into the characteristics of the above-mentioned representatives of the more pure and sober bent. The first to be noticed here is *John Ruysbroch* of Brussels, who being, as we have seen from his writings, a zealous opponent of that fanatical, pantheistic bent, had already, before retiring from the world, great trials to endure from the opposition of a wife belonging to the sect of the free spirit. She was one of those who laboured to disseminate their doctrines by the circulation of mystic writings in the vulgar language, and had formed around her a large party, whose hatred Ruysbroch incurred by the zeal with which he contended against this fanatical bent, so connected with sensual extravagances. Ruysbroch was much sought after by many belonging to districts on the Rhine, Strasburg, Basel, and France, and consulted for spiritual advice.

The writings of Ruysbroch evince—and the same thing is apparent also from the story of his life—that his contemplative habits did not hinder him from coming frequently into contact with his contemporaries. We find, therefore, that he was possessed of a profound knowledge of the religious condition of his contemporaries; he understood the dangers that threatened to come in from this source, and sought to guard against them. Though the externalization of the religious element and superstition were, in this period, the chief disturbers of the religious spirit, yet Ruysbroch knew how to detect the infidelity, also, that went along with them. This was, indeed, at first, wrapt up and concealed under the extravagances of that mysticism, that false inwardness and passivity, which Ruysbroch, as we have seen, so vigorously contended against; but we find hints in his writings, that, independent of this, the prevailing worldliness of spirit that cramped every movement of the higher life, had called forth a decided infidelity, which may have been but confirmed the more by the antagonism of the prevailing superstition. We know not but we should be thinking of some such root, rather than the aberrations of mysticism, when Ruysbroch, contending against such as denied every thing supernatural, says:[1] "They who lie without shame under mortal sins, care neither about God nor his grace, but esteem the virtues as nothing, spiritual life as

[1] De calculo, pag. 283.

hypocrisy or deception, and listen with disgust to all that is said about God or the virtues; convinced that there is no God, and no heaven or hell. Hence it is that they want to know about nothing but what strikes the senses:" and when he speaks of those bad Christians,[1] who blaspheme Christ, and set at nought his sacraments. We meet with expressions in his writings which, rent from their connection with his general drift and scope, separated from those passages where, as we have seen, he so emphatically contends against pantheism, might be misconstrued as an inclination to that error; as where he says:[2] "God dwells after the like true manner, as to his essence, in the wicked and the good, for he is the creator and preserver of all beings, and nearer and more within them than they are to themselves; he is the essence of their essence." So when he describes it as the highest position to be reached in time or eternity; "when we have the feeling and inward consciousness beyond all knowledge and science, and of a certain infinite, fathomless unknown; when we are dead to, and rise above all the names which we give to God or to creatures, or pass beyond them into something eternal, transcendent, which is incapable of being designated by any name, and lose ourselves therein; and when above all the exercises of virtue in us, we perceive and experience a certain eternal repose, wherein there is no activity; and above all blessed spirits, an infinite and immeasurable bliss, in which we are all one, and this unity itself, so far as it is possible to the creature, is the same that blessedness is in itself; and when, finally, we see all blessed spirits merged, blended, and lost in that essence which is higher than all substance."[3] But what preserved Ruysbroch, who, as we may see from the language above cited, in striving to pass beyond the limits of temporal consciousness and to anticipate the intuitions of the life eternal, might so easily have lost himself in those abysses, what preserved such a man from the pantheistic error, was the power of the moral element within him, it was that which Christ was to him, the connection of his Christian consciousness with his consciousness of God, his way of knowing God in Christ, his way of clinging to God revealed and to his word, and his profound recognition of this

1 Specul. aetern. salut. pag. 27. 2 De praecip. quibusd. virtut., p. 179.
3 De sept. amor. grad., pag. 226.

essence of personality; his way of connecting his faith in a personal supra-mundane God with the consciousness of his own personality. The characteristic thing in that mystic pantheism is in fact nothing more nor less than will, exalting itself above Christ, and the want of a strong moral sense. We may notice, therefore, what Ruysbroch says on this point:[1] "We cannot redeem ourselves; but if with all the capabilities we have we follow after Christ, then *our* acts are united with *his* acts, and become ennobled by his grace. Therefore has Christ redeemed us by his *own* acts and not by ours, and by his own merits has he made us free. But if we would possess and feel this freedom, then must *his* spirit kindle *our* spirits to love, and plunge us in the abyss of his love and most free goodness, where our spirits are baptized and endued with freedom, and united with *his* spirit, and that which constitutes our will dies to itself, and is absorbed in his will, so that we would will nothing but what God wills; for God's will has become our will—which is the root of true love. Accordingly, he says:[2] "Christ is our mirror and our rule, the rule for the right direction of our whole life. His humanity is the light of the divine glory whereby heaven and earth are enlightened, and will be to all eternity." "Though God"—says he[3]—"has withdrawn and hidden himself from thy view, yet thou art by no means hidden from him. For he lives in thee and has left thee his mirror and his image, the Lord Jesus Christ, his Son, that thou mightest carry him in thy hands, before thine eyes and in thy heart. . . . The kingdom of heaven is Jesus Christ himself, who by his grace lives in us; and the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and, by the power of Christ who lives in us and fights with us, we take it by force."[4] He understands how to seize the divine nature and the human nature of Christ in their intimate connection. "Because"—says he[5]—"Christ was in respect of that which is highest in him ever of the same will with the Father, though his nature was sensible to sorrow and anguish, yet he showed obedience, and having overcome the will of the sensuous part, he said to the Father, 'Not my will, but thine, be done.'" We have already observed how Ruysbroch contended against that one-sided con-

1 Specul. aetern. salut., pag. 14. 2 Ibid. pag. 32.
3 Ibid. pag. 13. 4 Ibid. pag. 15. 5 Ibid. pag. 14.

templative bent. And though he,[1] too, gave great prominence to the contemplative life of the spirit, yet he ever regarded love as the highest, and in this he finds the union of the contemplative and the practical habit. "If one"—says he—"should soar to a height of contemplation equal to any which Peter or Paul or any other of the apostles ever reached, but should be informed that some poor man stood in need of a warm broth, or of any other service, it would be far better that he should for the moment awake out of the repose of that contemplation and bestow aid on that poor man in true charity, than that he should surrender himself to the sweetness of his present contemplation; for God's commandments are not to be neglected for the sake of any exercise, however great it may be. Whoever—says he in another place[2]—would give himself up solely to contemplation, and neglect his neighbour in distress, has never attained to true intercourse with himself and the contemplative life, but is miserably deceived in his whole mode of life. And against such people it behoves us to be much on our guard." He affirms that for the sake of Christian perfection, one need not retire into solitude or to holy places. A man truly just, will be so in *all places* and with all men; and the same holds true of the unjust. But he is to be called a just man, who, after a true manner, perceives God, and this in all places, even in the public ways, and with all mortals no otherwise than in the church, or in his chamber, or in whatever other place he may have shut himself up." And he cites in illustration the words of Christ to the Samaritan woman. (John iv. 21) "Men"—says he[3]—"ought not to look so much at what they do, as at what they are. For if they are good at bottom, their deeds will easily be good also. Many place holiness in action; but this is not best; since holiness is, if I may so express it, to be placed in *being*. For however holy our works may be, they do not, as works, make us holy; but so far as we are holy ourselves, and our foundation is a holy one, so far we make our works, also, holy; and whether it be eating or drinking, sleeping, waking, praying, conversing, or fasting, so far as it is done from greater love to God and to the endless glory of God, so far

1 De praecip. quibusd. virtut., pag. 181.
2 Specul. aetern. salut., pag. 25 et 26.
3 De praecip. quibusd. virtut. pag. 176.

is it also something good. For the greater the love with which a man devotes himself to God, the holier is his foundation."[1] Ruysbroch was opposed also to the externality of the church tendency manifested in penance and such matters, as a one-sided, subjective bent. He says:[2] "Though many frequent the choir, day and night, read a great deal, sing, multiply words in prayer, and perform the like good works, yet these are valueless both to themselves and before God; because, with thoughts dissipated on outward objects, they 'walk after the flesh and not after the spirit.'" "Outward poverty"—says he[3]—"separated from the internal exercises and virtues, cannot find this way to God. If, on the other hand, one makes a wise and conscientious use of riches, if for the glory of God he liberally distributes them to the poor, he may find this way, which remains an unknown one to hypocrites who are poor against their will." "We may meet with many who lead a strict and austere life, and give themselves up to astonishing acts of penance, but their only end is to gain a great reputation for sanctity and a great reward. For natural love turns back upon itself, and longs after honour in this life, and a large reward in the next."[4] "Again"—he says[5]—"he who busies himself more with those exercises which take up the whole heart and soul, and bestows more attention on the multiplicity of works, than on their essence and end, and clings to his exercises, to sacraments, symbols, and outward usages, more than to the truth signified by them, he continues to be an outward man, swallowed up in mere doing; but the same man in his good works, if they are united with a simple temper, will obtain eternal life." "Every good work"—says he[6]—"however trifling, if done with love and a simple disposition, out of respect to God, obtains likeness to God and eternal life in him; for a simple disposition brings the scattered powers of the soul into unity, and places the spirit itself in union with God." One thing characterizing the ethical element in Ruysbroch, which secured him against the danger of pantheism, is the prominent place he gives to the will, which he describes as the main-spring, on which all

1 Ibid. pag. 173.
2 De quat. subtil. tentation. pag. 195.
3 De sept. amor. grad., pag. 220.
4 De ornatu spiritual. nuptiar, pag. 274.
5 Ibid. pag. 267.
6 Ibid. pag. 266 (ed. 1609 pag. 486).

development of the higher life depends. "All virtue, and all goodness"—says he[1] —depend on the will. He, therefore, wants nothing, who truly possesses a right will. If, then, thou longest to have humility, love, or any other of the virtues, thou hast but to will it in all seriousness and with thy whole soul, and of a certainty thou hast it, and none can deprive thee of it, be he God or man, if but thy will be right and godlike." And in another place,[2] he says what could hardly be acceptable to the advocates of the common view held by the church: "If one should maintain that a perfect will, without works, is worth as much as a good will, with works, at the same time, I should not be disposed strenuously to dispute such an opinion." A good will is born of the Holy Spirit itself; and, therefore, a good will is the living and free instrument whereby God accomplishes what he wills. A good will in man is the love shed abroad in him, through which he honours God, and cherishes and exercises all the virtues. Our good will is God's grace, and our supernatural life whereby we get the victory over all sins. A good will, united with the divine grace, makes us free, lifts us above ourselves, and unites us with God in the contemplative life. A good will, in its internal communion with God, is the spirit crowned with the eternal life; and when it is directed outwards, it is lord of all external actions; and the same is accordingly the kingdom of God, where God reigns by his grace. It includes love, and, lifted above itself, is blessed, united with God."[3] Much spiritual experience and sober sense are evinced in what Ruysbroch says, in reproving that tendency to self-reflection and tacit repose in the feelings whereby many in these times were led astray—a tendency noticed by chancellor Gerson, who, describing the dangers of the inner life of the soul, in his times, says:[4] "The *excessive* hunting after and brooding over feelings has deceived many." Now, when, for various reasons, such persons came to find the current of their religious feelings dried up, and to experience a dearth in their inner life, they were easily led to think themselves forsaken of God, and fell into despondency. He says many things on this subject having an important bear-

1 De praecip. quibusd. virtut., pag. 180. 2 Ibid. pag. 181.

3 Specul. aetern. salut., pag. 29.

4 Fefellit multos nimia sensimentorum conquisitio.

ing on the religious life of his contemporaries. He speaks of people, "Who strove after many special favours, had their particular prayers, and requested this and that thing of God. Hence, they were often deceived. God permitted the things they desired to be given them by evil spirits; while they, however, ascribed the answer to their own holiness, and believed they deserved it all. Nor should we wonder at this, since they suffer under the distemper of pride, and are neither touched nor enlightened by God. They cling therefore to themselves; a trifling comfort rejoices them beyond measure, because they are not aware of their great deficiencies. They are bent on seeking after spiritual enjoyments, which may well be called a spiritual debauch, because it is an inordinate desire of natural love, which always has prime regard to itself, and seeks its own advantage."[1] "The effects of love often seem of great importance, as triumphant joy, devotion, and the like; but these are not always the more desirable and better states of feeling, for they may exist without true love. *Nature* is often wont to bestow such sweetness of temper, or by God's permission, even the spirit of all evil may excite such feelings in a man. Nor is he to be called a more holy man than others, who abounds in such feelings. Hence, it is our duty to inquire whether such feelings have been bestowed by God, and for what purpose. For such feelings, God, in his love, is often wont to bestow, for the purpose of stimulating the soul to aim at something higher, and of keeping it in the right direction of life. But as he, on whom they are bestowed, makes progress in true love, he gradually pays less regard to such sweetness of the feelings. While he maintains his fidelity, however, in such times of refreshment, the Christian should still be watchful, and consider whether it flows from true love; and even if it be clear that such is the case, yet it is not for this reason the best thing, as will be evident if we reflect that such enjoyments must ever be regarded as of far less value than any service, bodily or spiritual, which we can bestow on another."[2] In respect to the consciousness of spiritual dearth, he says:[3] "If thou sometimes feelest within thee a certain stub-

[1] De ornatu spiritual. nuptiar. pag. 274.
[2] De praecip. quibusd. virtut., pag. 181.
[3] Specul. aetern. salut., pag. 13.

bornness of nature, a troubled heart and an oppressive burden; if thou feelest thyself deprived of all taste for spiritual things; if thou appearest to thyself deserted of God, poor, and destitute of all comfort; if thou supposest thyself suffering under a disgust of all external and internal exercises, and feelest thyself depressed by such a load, as if thou must sink to the earth; be not for all this perplexed in thy soul, but leave thyself in the hands of the Lord, and let it only be thy prayer that God's will may be done, and that all should be subservient to his glory. Believe me, the dark cloud will soon be dissipated, and the radiance of the beaming sun of our Lord Jesus Christ will be poured over thee with a more excellent comfort and a more excellent grace than thou hast ever felt before; and this on account of thy self-renunciation and thy humble resignation under all the load laid upon thee." Accordingly, he looks upon all such sufferings of the soul as an exercise of self-denial, a training to a total surrendry of the heart to God, with the renunciation of self and of all creatures; and for consolation and example he adverts to the state of soul in Christ, when he uttered those words on the cross, "My God, why hast thou forsaken me," which such persons doubtless know how to understand better than all others. "In order"—says he[1] "that we may not only bear such things with equanimity from men, but also patiently suffer the rod of our Lord himself, when he withdraws the comfort of his presence, removing so far from us, that it seems as if a wall separated between Him and us; and if we come in our distress for comfort and help, placing himself towards us as if he shut his eyes upon us and would neither see nor hear us, leaving us to struggle alone with our sufferings and sorrows as he himself, too, was forsaken of his Father; then, in the midst of all this we must fly to his deity as our refuge, that so, remaining unshaken amid all our depression, we may seek our consolation in no mortal creature or thing, nor anywhere but in that word which Christ himself uttered, 'Thy will be done,' which words are the most agreeable of all to God; and he who can express this from the deep meaning of his heart, can never be disturbed or fall into any great depression; but he will experience in his very resignation a

[1] De præcip. quibusd. virtut., pag. 175.

peculiar peace, because God is the end of the self-denial." In regard to tempting thoughts, he says:[1] "If in thy praying, or thy spiritual exercises strange thoughts or images enter thy mind, whatever they may be, if they be not to the purpose before thee, be not disturbed by them, but turn away at once, with the whole bent of thy mind and love to God. For although the hellish foe shows thee thy wares, still they will not stay by thee if thou art not inclined to them in thy affections. Therefore, if thou wouldst easily overcome all things, seek to keep thy soul ever directed upward and turned inward."

John Tauler was born in Strasburg, in the year 1290; in the year 1308 he entered the Dominican order. It is worthy of remark that he expresses himself somewhat doubtful whether it belongs to the true following after Christ to live by the alms of others instead of labouring for one's self. He says in a sermon:[2] "Had I known, when I was my father's son, what I now know, I would have lived upon his labour, and not upon alms." He studied at Paris; and so we find him citing what was taught in the schools.[3] But, as is evident from what has been earlier said, the theology that is not to be learned from books was esteemed by him as of much higher value. We have already remarked how, in the time of the papal interdict, and of the ravages of the black death, he continued fearlessly to labour in promoting the spiritual good of the people. He preached at Cologne and in the different cities on the Rhine, and died in the year 1361. Tauler, as well as Ruysbroch, contended against the prevailing tendency to the external in religion. He says:[4] "God gave all things that they might be a way to himself, and He only should be the end. Do you dream that it is a jest? Nay, verily. Your station makes you neither blessed nor holy. Neither my cowl, nor my bald head, nor my convent, nor my holy society, nor any of these things makes me holy." Accordingly he declaims against the various self-mortifications and voluntarily imposed exercises of penance, by which men destroyed their minds and bodies instead of making any real progress in sanctification. Thus he

1 Specul. actern. salut., pag. 12.
2 Bas. ed. fol. 120 b.; Fr. ed. ii., p. 419.
3 See above, page 523.
4 Sermons, Bas. ed. fol. 146 a; Fr. ed. iii., p. 120.

says: "Some men are not content with the myrrh which God gives them, they would load their stomachs with still more, and give themselves the head-ache and sick fancies, and have suffered long and much, and fail to do things rightly, and little grace comes to them from it all, when they build on their own plan, whether in penance or abstinence, or in prayer or devotion."[1] In the case of prayer, he makes the inward disposition the main thing. "Praying by memory," he says, "is profitable only so far as it stirs up the man to this noble (internal) devotion; and then the noble incense bursts forth; and when that flows out, let the prayer of the lips boldly proceed."[2] He says again, that by love, the supreme virtue, all vows are paid; since the fulfilling of all which those vows proposed is contained in love. Now if a man has made many vows, to pray, to fast, to make pilgrimages and the like, he is exempt and free from all these, when he enters into an order; as soon as he is in the order he is bound to all the virtues and to God. Rightly therefore do I also say here, that to however many things a man may have bound himself to God, if he comes into real true love, he is free from them all, so long as true sincerity of heart is in him."[3] Speaking of those who would be righteous by outward works, he says: "They abide in this, that they do great works, such as fasting, much watching, and praying; yet do not clearly see their foundation. They find their interest and themselves in sensual enjoyment, favour and disfavour. And hence are engendered unjust and incorrect judgments; and then many failings and imperfections, such as pride, outward or inward, bitterness or self-will, quarrelsomeness, and many faults of the like kind."[4] He speaks against those who referred morality to the relations of this world, excluding the higher aspirations after that which is above the world, the craving that passes beyond things earthly to lay hold on eternal life. "These men"—says he[5]—"stray away into the rational exercise of the virtues, and thus find such pleasure and delight in this, that they are kept at a distance from the truth which is nearest

1 Bas. ed. fol. 8 a; Fr. ed. i., p. 141.

2 Bas. ed. fol. 8 b; Fr. ed.

3 Bas. ed. fol. 17 a. [This sermon appears to be wanting in the Fr. edition.]

4 Bas. ed. fol. 19 b; Fr. ed. i., p. 192.

5 The same.

and highest, stopping short at the present pleasure, instead of seeking after the eternal God through all pleasure." He reprimands those who placed their dependence on saints or angels, instead of reposing their whole trust in God. He says:[1] "There are some spiritual men, who are not content to be without comfort. For rather than to be simply and truly without comfort, and found empty and naked, they would resort to heavenly creatures, saints and angels, and entertain these in their minds with a spiritual pleasure, and set these before them for a comfort. As, for example, *this* saint is loved by me above other saints, or *this* angel above other angels. And then if any one objects to this, declaring that it is an unpermitted thing, that it should not be done, they have small pleasure in this, perhaps they are displeased; and this is at once a wrong, and a great hindrance to thee in thy business with God." We have seen how Tauler regarded the pious observance of all outward rites prescribed by the church as a preparatory school for the highest stage of spirituality, of the contemplative religious life; how therefore these Friends of God were opposed to those who outwardly and arbitrarily cast off all external observances. The casting aside of these ordinances should not be a *purposed* thing; it should be a natural falling off of them; as if the internal development of the religious life had progressed to such a point, that the outward rites which were no longer needed as supports, must fall away of themselves. And here we may observe the difference between the men of this bent and the violent reformers, those fanatical Beghards and the Brethren of the Free Spirit. But we may remark also how easily the transition might be made from these principles to that application of them. We find the following passage in Tauler,[2] which begins with a beautiful comparison: "We gladly break off and strip away the leaves, to let the sun pour his rays without hindrance, upon these young grapes. So all helps that become hindrances fall away from the Christian —images of saints, knowledge, exercises, and prayer, and all means. The man should not *cast* these aside, however, but wait till they fall off themselves, through divine grace; that is, when the man is trained up to a higher stage, beyond all his under-

1 Bas. ed. fol. 20 a; Fr. ed. i., p. 194.
2 Bas. ed. fol. 21 b; Fr. ed. i., p. 199.

standing." Tauler, moreover, opposes the one-sided contemplative bent, which depised the practical. He requires the union and mutual interpenetration of the two elements. He understood the dangers of those who, without matured experience, would betake themselves to the contemplative life alone. He looks upon the practical life as a needful probation; and says in this regard of the young people: "One should not lay down to repose in the noble country of contemplation. He may perhaps pass in there for a while, but he should fly back again, as long as he is not fully mature, and is still young and unpractised and imperfect."[1] Moreover, he speaks against the tendency of wanting to luxuriate continually in sweet feelings, and says:[2] "It is no great distress if a man is not always jubilant and in sweet enjoyment; for all this is but a chance gift of God, that is, when the essential thing of a devout temper abides in the man." He speaks of those who, when times of stumbling followed after pleasant enjoyments, knew not upon what to fix and steady themselves. "Their sweet emotions"—says he[3]—"have turned out a weak foundation on which they have been trusting, instead of trusting truly in God, solely and alone, in love and suffering." This luxuriating in sweet feelings was, according to him, the evil germ from which the tendency of those enthusiastic Friends of God, who had sunk down into pantheistic self-deification, had evolved itself, and he remarks:[4] "There are some who so rest in the sweetness of enjoyment as to fall into an improper freedom." He defines it as a sinking back of nature into itself, finds in it therefore an intermixture of the natural and divine. It appears to him a self-constituted, artificial state of being, which he compares to the employment of a multiplicity of remedies, that hinder nature in her own healthy and spontaneous re-actions, and he observes: "In these pleasant moods and states nature bends back upon herself with agility, and quietly awaits the result of that to which the man is, above all things, inclined, and abandons herself to security; and just that happens which I have heard from physicians, that it is not a good thing for men

1 Bas. ed. fol. 7 a; Fr. ed. i., p. 135.
2 Bas. ed. fol. 134 a; Fr. ed. iii., p. 218.
3 Bas. ed. fol. 46 a; Fr. ed. ii., p. 113.
4 Bas. ed. fol. 48 a; Fr. ed. ii., p. 121.

to use many drugs,[1] for, when nature finds herself helped, she trusts to that and sits down and rests, and she thinks she has the right help, and works not so diligently as she otherwise does. But when she is uncertain of all help, she contrives, and works, and helps herself." He warns against turning the thoughts inward too much on one's self, against despondency under temptations, which ought to be regarded as a means designed for the purification of the soul. He says:[2] "Have good courage, then, and be joyful and not sorrowful nor melancholy, though wicked, impure thoughts may sometimes intrude into your minds; let them be as wicked as they may, pay no attention to them. For if they come up contrary to thy thoughts and wishes, so let them fall out again. And should this happen to thee, most of all in prayer and in thy approaches to God, let them alone in the name of God, and suffer this conflict and these impure suggestions right cheerfully and humbly and quietly by the will of God." So in the times of spiritual dearth, when the sensible presence of God is wanting, and the soul feels itself forsaken by Him, he warns men not to despair, but to recognize in this an appointment of Providence designed for the saving good of man, for the promotion of the divine life. "We must"—says he[3]—"intend and seek God by himself. And this foretaste of the great true wedding many people would fain have, and complain that it cannot be. And if they experience no wedding on the deep ground of their being, when they pray or perform other exercises, and find not God's presence, it vexes them; and this they do less, or less willingly, and say they have no experience of God. Therefore they grow weary of their pains-taking and praying. This a man should never do. We should never do a duty the less on such account: for God was present there, but we perceived him not. Yet he went secretly to the wedding. Where God is, there in truth is the wedding. And he cannot be away from it; where a man simply thinks of Him and seeks Him alone, there God must of necessity be, either sensibly or in a hidden manner." He adduces in illustration the case of the

1 [The Bas. ed. reads: das sy vil *aertzet* hetten, which doubtless signifies drugs. Ed.]

2 Bas. ed. fol. 134 a; Fr. ed. iii., p. 217.

3 Bas. ed. fol. 31 a; Fr. ed. i., p. 266.

apostles. They must be deprived of *visible* intercourse with the Saviour; meantime they must have believed they were forsaken; but it was that they might be prepared for the invisible communion with the Saviour, and for the receiving of the Holy Ghost. "Children"—he says[1]—"as to this matter, it is seriously to be considered by us, and we must understand that, to the beloved disciples of God and his beloved friends, the Holy Ghost could not be given till Jesus Christ had first gone away from them. Not at all different then is coldness, want of comfort, ineptitude, so that we feel heavy and slow to every good work, and cold and dark; for thus has Christ departed from us. If all men would see into this, and make it profitable and fruitful to themselves, it were a useful, noble, blessed, divine thing." In another place he says, after citing the words of Christ, John xvi. 7, "The holy disciples were then possessed, within and without, with the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, and he so filled up every corner of their being, heart, soul, sense, and powers of body and mind, that the possession must be out, or must be away. If they were to come to the true, spiritual, inward comfort, this possession must needs be cut away from them, however sour and bitter it might be to them; they would otherwise have to abide at the lowest stage, and in the senses."[2] Accordingly he speaks of the various leadings of Providence connected with the internal development of the soul, to which men ought simply to resign themselves, instead of choosing their own way. He says:[3] "God comes with terrible conflicts, and in wonderful events, and singular ways, which none can understand but he who experiences them. Men therefore have remarkable, mysterious sufferings among them, diverse forms of the bitter drug, so that they are at a loss which way to turn; but God knows well what he means by it all." He gives prominence to trust in Christ as the means of obtaining victory over all temptations, and says:[4] "When he (the devout man) cannot overcome the dogs he contends with, nor get rid of them, he should run in great haste to the tree of the cross, and of the passion of our dear Lord Jesus Christ; there

1 Bas. ed. fol. 36 a; Fr. ed. ii., p. 69.
2 Bas. ed. fol. 48 b; Fr. ed. ii., p. 122.
3 Bas. ed. fol. 8 a; Fr. ed. i., p. 141.
4 Bas. ed. fol. 28 b; Fr. ed. i., p. 161.

alone he may cleave asunder the heads of the dogs that assault him; that is, he there obtains the victory in all his conflicts and is entirely delivered and rid of them."

The third individual whose character deserves to be portrayed with some minuteness, was *Henry Suso* of Suabia, a Dominican. He was born in the year 1300 and died in 1365. He was the author of various writings, composed in the form of dialogues and in other forms, in the German language, and afterwards translated into Latin, in which writings also we may discern the religious bent of this class of the Friends of God. He is no less remarkable than Tauler for giving prominence to the mediation of Christ as necessary to the attaining to true communion with God, and was thus distinguished from those pantheistic mystics who, without any mediation, were for sinking directly into the depths of the divine essence. Thus he represents Christ as saying: "No man may ascend to the divine heights nor have any sweet foretaste of bliss, except he be first drawn by the image of my human lowliness and sorrow. The higher a man climbs without passing through my humanity, the lower he falls. My humanity is the way he should take, my sufferings the door through which he should press."[1] The practical following after Christ was considered of more value by him than all transitory excitement of feeling. He makes Christ say: "No man better shows forth how near my suffering comes to him, than he who bears it with me in the exhibition of good works. Dearer to me is an empty heart regardless of earthly loves, and constantly diligent in pursuing the next duty after working out the example of my sufferings, than if thou wert continually complaining to me, and honouring my sorrow with as many tears of grief as ever drops of rain fell from the skies; for that thou mightest follow me was the end for which I suffered the bitter death; though thy tears also are well-pleasing and acceptable." Patience in suffering seemed to him of more value than miracles, as he says:[2] "Never was there so much gazing at a knight who has come off well at the tournament, as there is gazing of all the heavenly host at a man who comes off well in suffering. All the saints stand sureties for a

1 In his "Little book of Eternal Wisdom." Comp. Diepenbrock; Suso's Life and Writings. Regensburg, 1829, p. 249, (2d ed. 1837, p. 181).

2 The same, p. 253, (2d ed., p. 184).

suffering man; for they have already experienced it before, and cry out with common mouth, that it is no poison, but a wholesome drink. Patience in suffering is greater than calling the dead to life, or other miraculous signs; it is the narrow way which opens richly onward to the gate of heaven."

Among the religious appearances which grew out of these times of distress and of excitement in Germany, and extended into the fifteenth century, belong too the *processions of the Scourgers or Flagellants.* It was first in Italy, in the thirteenth century, that, amid the contests carried on with the wildest extravagance of passion between the party friendly to the pope, and the party who went with the emperor,—the Guelphs and Ghibellines, strong feelings of remorse followed suddenly after the tumult of these passionate contests. Vast bodies of men, girded with ropes, marched in procession, with songs and prayer, through the cities and from one city to another, calling on the people to repent. All hostilities ceased. The momentary impression produced by these singular processions was powerful, though it did not last long. Such processions spread from Italy to other countries. In Germany in particular, the impression produced by the desolating ravages of the black death contributed to call forth such demonstrations; though even here, a lasting work of repentance by no means followed, in the case of most; but good men were forced to complain that avarice and every sort of selfish vice afterwards prevailed to a greater extent than ever.[1] Large bodies of men marched through Flanders, France, Germany, singing hymns and scourging themselves till the blood flowed freely. And as the civil magistrates and ecclesiastical authorities now found it necessary to interfere on account of the danger to civil and ecclesiastical order, and on account of the violation of public decency connected with the rapid spread of this fanatical tendency, Pope Clement VI. for example forbidding these processions on penalty of the ban, it was necessarily driven (since those who were seized with this fanatical spirit

1 D'Achery Spicil. iii. 110: Nam homines fuerunt postea magis avari et tenaces, cum multo plura bona quam antea possiderent; magis etiam cupidi et per lites, brigas et rixas atque per placita seipsos conturbantes . . . . Caritas etiam ab illo tempore refrigescere coepit valde, et iniquitas abundavit cum ignorantiis et peccatis.

would not abandon its impulse) into an opposition to the church which did not originally belong to it. The prevailing dissatisfaction with a corrupt church, and the opposition to that church which existed already in the age, impressed their own peculiar stamp on these appearances also; and in the next following times these processions took an heretical direction. Those who joined in them spoke of the corruptions of the church, predicted approaching judgments, announced that all the sacraments in the church were profaned by her pollutions and had lost their validity, that but one sacrament as they supposed remained, which was to copy, after their manner, the sufferings of Christ. Hence they were called *cruci fratres*. Many of them died at the stake.

END OF VOL. NINTH.

GENERAL INDEX.

Aegidius of Rome, 18, 20.
Agoust, Bertrand de. See Clement V.
Albert of Cracow, 509.
Albic, 375—401.
Alexander V., 112, 113, 123, 128, 352, 360.
Anagni, 16, 62.
Andreas, tailor at Prague, 433.
Angelo, Cardinal Peter of St., 399.
Anna of England, 327.
Antichrist. Militz's work on. A. Janow's work on A. 314, 320. Huss's work on A. 330.
Apostoli, 493.
Aquileia, 103.
Aragon, 104.
Aretin, 97, 98, 99, 102, 104, 135.
Armagh, Richard of, 183.
Aschbach, 445, n.
Austie, 407.
Avignon. Residence of the popes in, 27, 29. Clement VII. in A. 63. The papal court in A., 90. Militz dies in A. 218

Bacon, Roger, 182.
Baden, Hans of, 444.
Balle, John, 215.
Baptise. Bernard, 153.
Basle, 58, 532. Letters missive for, and commencement of the council at, 173, 180.
Beghards and Beguines as names of reproach, 300, 391, 527. Mystical Beghards, 535.
Benedict XI., 26.
Benedict XII., 54, 55.
Benedict XIII., 71, 74, 75, 151, 159.
Bernhard, bishop of Cita di Castello, 449.
Bibruch, 437.
Bischofteinitz, 237.
Black Plague, 522.
Bohmisch. Brod, 402.
Bologna, 377.
Boniface VIII., 2, 17, 25. Proceedings with regard to his memory, 17, 30.
Boniface IX., 69, 70, 120, 342, 375.
Boseo, Peter de, 9.
Brancas, Cardinal, 370, 399.
Brigitta of Sweden, 59, 301.
Broda, Andrew of, 350.
Brogni, Jean de, 468.
Bruges, 186.
Brussels, 547.
Butler, 205, n.

Caietan, Cardinal Benedict. See Boniface VIII.
Cambray, Robert of. See Clement VII.
Cardinalis, John. See Reinstein.
Causis, Michael de, 399, 437, 446, 449, 485, 513.
Cesarini, Cardinal Juliano, 173.
Charles IV., 56, 58, 236 248, 250, 331.
Charles V. of France, 65.
Charles VI. of France, 71.
Charles of Durazzo, king of Naples, 68.
Chesena, Michael of, 33.
Chlum, John of, 435, 437, 445, 446, 453, 474, 486, 500, 502.
Chotek, Bernard, 400.
Clemangis, Nicholas of, 71, 76, 77, 84, 87, 95, 104, 119, 120, 122, 126, 154, 157.
Clement V., 27, 31.
Clement VI., 55, 58, 315, 562.
Clement VII., 63, 75, 78, 223.
Clericos laicos, bull, 6.
Coelestin V., 2.
Cologne, 520.
Colonna, the family of, 5, 6, 16, 27, 99. Otto of Colonna. See Martin V.
Conrad of Waldhausen. See Waldhausen.
Constance, banishment of the clergy at, 56. Letters missive for the council of, 136. Council of Constance, 139, 173.
Corario, Cardinal Angelo. See Gregory XII.
Cervaro, Peter of. See Nicholas V.
Cossa, Balthasar. See John XXIII.
Courtney, 201.
Cracow, 509.
Cracowec, 430.
Cremsia, 236.
Creutz, 320.
Cusa, Nicholas of, 176.

Dacher, 444, n.
D'Ailly, 349, 464, 468, 482.
Dante, 15.
Defensor pacis. See Marsilius of Padua.
Duba, Wenzel of, 435, 436, 466.
Durand, 333.

Ebnerin, Margaret, 523. n.
Eckhart, Master, 537.
Edward III., 183, 199.
Ernest, Archbishop of Prague, 253.
Eugine IV., 173.

Falkènberg, John of, 172.
Faulfisch, Nicholas of, 333, n.
Ferredi, 63.
Festum fatuorum, 110.
Flagellants, 562.
Franciscans, the more strict and the more lax, 33.
Frederic VI., burgrave of Nuremberg, 466.
Frederic of Austria, 139, 143, 150.
Friends of God, 57, 520, 562.

Gentianus, 148, 149.
Germans, protest of the Germans at Constance, 164, 168. Emigration of the Germans from Prague, 344.
Gerson, 71, 85, 105, 112, 114, 117, 125, 126, 127, 134, 145, 147, 172, 173, 431, 480, 511.
Ghibellines and Guelphs, 4, 5, 32, 562.
Gottleben, 151, 463.
Greeks, union with the. Gerson on this subject, 124, 125. Jerome of Prague on this subject, 508, 509.
Gregory XI., 59, 60, 75, 171, 186, 199, 248.
Gregory XII., 97, 151, 346, 375.
Grosshead, Robert, 182.

Hallam, Robert, 164.
Hardt, Hermann of, 450.
Heidelberg, 507.
Hessen, Henry of. See Langenstein.
Hildegard, the prophecies of, 519.
Hirschau, 511.
Hubner, 335.
Huss, 65, 319, 506.
Husinetz, 319.

Indulgences, Wicklif against Indulgences, 375. Huss on, 381, 390.
Innocent VI., 59.
Innocent VII., 95—336.
Inquisition, 535.
Islep, 184.

Jacob, 405.
Jacobellus, 451, 461.
Janduno, John of, 33, 199.
Janow, Matthias of, 261, 320.
Jerome of Prague, 333, 343, 344, 388, 506, 518.
Jesenic, 369, 399.
Jews, converted by Conrad of Waldhausen, 252.
Jizin, Master Von, 393.
Jistebnitz, Sigmund of, 340.
Joachim, writings of the abbot, 184, 519.
John XXII., 31, 54, 199, 539.
John XXIII., 120, 151, 356, 375, 447, 448, 462, 466.
John of Antioch, 146.
John, Patriarch of Constantinople, 449.
John of Leitomysl, 402, 403, 464.
John, bishop of Lubec (Lebus), 449.
John of Paris, 18, 21, 25, 208.
Jubilee, J. Boniface VIII., 4. Reduction of the time of the J. to 50 years by Clement VI., 55. Reduction to 30 years by Urban VI., 69.

Kebel, John of, 340.
Klonkot, 248.
Knighton, 203.
Knights Templar, suppression of their order, 30.
Knin, Matthias. Pater of, 340.
Kozibradek, 407.

Ladislaus of Naples, 99, 102, 121, 135, 375, 385.
Lambeth, 201.
Lancaster, Duke of, 125, 185, 200, 220.
Langenstein, Henry of. From Hessia, 62, n. 66.
Langham, Simon, 184.
Latzemback, Henry of, 447.
Lazan, Henry of, 430.
Lazan, Lefl of, 431.
Leipsic, 345.
Leitmeritz, 250.
Lenfant, 491, n.
Limoisin, 61.
Lollards, 195, 196.
London, council at, 220.
Lord's Supper. Wicklif's doctrine of the, 210, 215. Janow on the frequent participation of, 299, 314. Janow's approval of the distribution of the Lord's Supper in both forms, 314.
Louis, the Bavarian, 32, 57.
Louis of Bavaria, 151, 505.
Lucca, 100, 102.
Luna, Peter of. See Benedict XIII.
Lutterworth, 192.
Lyons, Clement's coronation at, 27.

Malatesta, 151.
Marci, Cardinal S., 140, 464.
Marseilles, 98.
Marsilius of Padua, author of the Defensor pacis, 33, 51.
Martin V., 170, 173.
Martin, disciple of Huss, 435.
Mauritius of Prague, 351.
Mendicants, Clemangis on the, 79. Richard of Armagh, their opponent, 183. Wicklif and the mendicants, 186, 192, 197, 219. Militz and the mendicants, 245. Conrad of Waldhausen and the mendicants, 256.
Merswin, Rulmann, 529.
Michael of Deutschbrod, or de Causis, 399, 408, 437.
Milheim, John of, 320.
Militz, 236, 249, 319.
Mladenowic, Peter of, 435, 452, 466, 501, 512.

Nass, Doctor, 369.
Nicholas V., 49, 50.
Nicholas of Basle, 532.
Nicholas of Leitomysl, 334.
Nieder, John, 519.
Niem, Theodoric of, 70, 76, 97, 99, 102, 120, 123.

Nordlingen, Henry of, 301, 523, n.
Nogaret, William of, 15.
Nurenberg, 436, 520.

Occam, William, 33, 51.
Oertel, John, 406.
Ofen, 508.
Oxford, 182, 183, 192, 199, 328, 331.

Paganus, Peter, 331. n.
Palacky, 330, n. 332 n.
Paletz, 160, 332, 402, 422, 437, 446, 449, 451, 457, 485.
Pantheistic Friends of God, 536.
Pappenheim, martial of the empire, 506.
Paris, university of, 315, 507, 555. Liberal tendencies of, 29, 65, 66, 71, 122, 123, 126. See also Gerson, D'Ailly, Clemangis, Langenstein.
Pavia, 173.
Percy, Henry, 200.
Pernau, 436.
Peter of Dresden, 460.
Petrarch, 59, 91.
Philargi, Cardinal Peter. See Alexander V.
Philip the Fair of France, 6.
Piccolomini, Aeneas Silvio, 518, n.
Pisa, flight of the cardinals of Gregory XII. to P. 104. Appointment of the council at Pisa, 104. Council of P., 110, 118.
Plaul, Master, 112.
Plescow, 509.
Poggio, 516, 517.
Prachatic, 430.
Prachatic, Christiann of, 405, 421.
Prague, 345. Synod of Prague, A.D. 1389, 299, 316. Synod of Prague, A.D. 1413, 404. Trial at Prague, A.D. 1414, 348. See also Militz, Conrad of Waldhausen, Huss, Jerome.
Prato, Cardinal da, 26, 29.
Predestination, doctrine of, by Wicklif, 227, 228.
Privagno of Bari. See Urban VI.
Property, rights of. Wicklif's views respecting the, 190. Views of Huss, 365.

Ratolfszell, 151.
Retchenthal, Ulrie, 444, n.
Reinstein, John Cardinalis of, 369, 436, 446.
Richard II., 200.
Roger, cardinal; see Gregory XI.
Rome, council at, A.D. 1412, 122; Militz at Rome, 244; Conrad of Waldhausen at R. 250; Janow at Rome, 261.
Rudolph of Austria, 260.
Rupert, Emperor, 113, 347.
Ruysbrock, 527, 540, 547, 555.

Saint worship, opposed by Wicklif, 230; defended by Huss, 441.
Saiset de Pamiers, 8.
Sacraments, Wicklif opposed to the multiplication of, 232; see also Lord's Supper.
Savona, 100.
Schaffhausen, 144, 462.
Schism in the church, 63, 144.
Siena, 100, 173.
Siena, Catherine of, 59.
Sigismund, emperor, 135, 136, 142, 144, 146, 150, 160, 170, 431, 433, 449, 462, 467, 484, 489, 502, 503, 505.
Sophia of Bohemia, 368, 391.
Stekna, 350.
Stephen of Dola, 341, 356, 401.
Stitney, Thomas of, 333 n.
Strasburg, 522, 531.
Suabia, 561.
Sudbury, 201, 319.
Suso, Henry, 529, 561.

Tauler, 521, 522, 555, 561.
Theodoric, disciple of Militz, 244.
Tiem, Wenzel, 438.
Toulouse, University of, 85.
Transubstantiation, Doctrine of, attacked by Wicklif, 206, 213; Huss on the doctrine of, 369, 381, 459, 460, 461; Stanislaus of Znaim on the doctrine of, 332.
Trevisa, John of, 202.
Turlepinus, 290.

Ueberlingen, 510.
Unigenitus, constitution, 55.
Unam sanctam, bull, 11.
Urban V., 59, 184, 243.
Urban VI., 62, 64, 223, 303.
Urie, Zacharias of, 144.

Vechta, Conrad of, 401.
Vienna, 507.
Vienne, council at, A.D. 1311, 30; Nicholas of Basle burnt at, 535.
Villani on Boniface VII., 8, n.; on his death, 17; on Clement V., 29, 30; on John XXII., and his deposition, 48, 51.
Vincennes, 65.
Viterbo, 100.

Waldensians, 532.
Waldhausen, Conrad of, 249, 261, 350.
Wallenrod, John of, 501.
Wellenowitz, Nicholas of, 340.
Wenzel of Bohemia, 327, 342, 346, 369, 406.
Winterther, John of, 55 n., 57, 58.
Wietow, 507.
Wicklif, 183, 236; Wicklif's influence on Huss and Wicklifite movements in Bohemia, 326.
Wilsnack, 322.
Witepsk, 509.
Witold of Lithuania, 509.
Wladislaw of Poland, 508.
Woodhall, 184.

Zabarella, 147, 149, 370, 469, 471, 484, 516.
Zbynek, 322, 336, 342, 370, 370, 371.
Zdenek of Lebaun, 405.
Zebrak, 398.
Znaim, Peter of, 332.
Znaim, Stanislaus of, 319, 332, 402.

00111824

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 March, 2016